

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

OCT 23 1935

VOLUME XXX

NUMBER 4

October 1935

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

GORDON JENNINGS LAING
JAKOB A. O. LARSEN
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CAMPBELL BONNER, *University of Michigan*
GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN, *University of California*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*
FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
KENNETH SCOTT, *Western Reserve University*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXX

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1935

No. 4

Catullan Echoes in the <i>Odes</i> of Horace	By Clarence W. Mendell	289
Scrutiny and Appeal in Athenian Citizenship	By Aubrey Diller	302
Parresiasic Poems of Horace	By Norman W. De Witt	312
"Εμπορος, Ναύκληρος, and Κάπηλος: A Prolegomena to the Study of Athenian Trade	By Moses I. Finkelstein	320
Notes and Discussions		337
FRANK GRANGER: The Emendation of Vitruvius.—CHARLES H. BEESON: The Manuscript Problem of Vitruvius.—A. D. WINSPEAR: A Note on Plato <i>Republic</i> v. 450b. 3: <i>χρηστοχρηστας</i> .—G. W. ELDERKIN: Dolon's Disguise in the <i>Rhesus</i> .—WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER: A Note on Seneca <i>Apocolocyntosis</i> vii. 1.—C. H. OLDFATHER: A Forgotten Emendation of Strabo XVI. 4. 10.—ANNA COX BRINTON: The Horace Check-List.		
Book Reviews		354
ULRICH KAHRSTEDT: <i>Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen: Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens</i> , Teil I. (West).—JAMES HOUSTON BAXTER: <i>St. Augustine Select Letters, with an English Translation</i> (Mouffe).—HANS DREXLER: <i>Die Komposition von Terenz' "Adelphen" und Plautus' "Rudens"</i> (Hough).—WERNER JAEGER: <i>Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of His Development</i> (Einatson).—PAUL DAMERAU: <i>Kaiser Claudius II. Gothicus (268-270 n. Chr.)</i> (Van Sickle).—J. P. V. D. BALSDON: <i>The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)</i> (Scott).—A. BERTHELOT: <i>Festus Avenius: Ora maritima</i> (Sanford).—ADELINE BELLE HAWES: <i>Citizens of Long Ago: Essays on Life and Letters in the Roman Empire</i> (Haight).—ARTHUR JOHN HOPKINS: <i>Alchemy, Child of Greek Philosophy</i> (Heidel).—R. F. COLSON AND G. H. WHITAKER (trans.): <i>Philo</i> (Winspear).		
Books Received		373
Index to Volume XXX		375

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. ¶ The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). ¶ Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application. For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., 211 Honan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

Chicago

No. 4

289

302

312

320

337

354

373

375

city of
year;
etage
public
Rice,
lands,
a and
ntries
are
rafts.

RESS,
ation.

opies,
ents,
pub-
stock

CLAS-

, and

1912.
ed on

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXX

OCTOBER 1935

Number 4

CATULLAN ECHOES IN THE *ODES* OF HORACE

BY CLARENCE W. MENDELL

IN HIS pocket edition of Horace, Walter Savage Landor scribbled on a margin opposite the twenty-seventh ode of Book iii "sad stuff." Much has been said about this ode, and most of it in disparagement, but criticism has not gone far beyond the uncritical verdict of Landor. It has, to be sure, been constantly pointed out that the opening stanzas are lacking in clarity and that the local setting for the ancient myth is not presented with Horace's customary skill; also that the transition from the setting to the myth is at least a trifle awkward. All this is merely a detailed elaboration of the feeling that inspired Landor's "sad stuff." Bergk undertook a more critical analysis of the poem and proposed the theory that Horace was following Simonides when he wrote this ode and that the model was a dithyramb by the Greek lyricist. It is true that the story of Europa was the subject of a dithyramb by Simonides, but the subject was also treated by Stesichorus and by Bacchylides, and it is difficult to follow Bergk precisely without further evidence. To confirm the theory of a Greek model it has been pointed out that the omen of the *laevis picus* (l. 15) is a Greek conception in contrast with the Latin and that the use of the infinitive in line 73 is essentially a Greek usage. There is not a great deal in any of this which is at all conclusive. The poem is obviously far from a perfect one, and it suggests at least the study of a Greek model.

Before accepting the suggestion of dithyrambic origin, one should consider the form of the poem in relation with others of Horace's *Odes* more successful but not unlike this one in construction. The fact

that Ode 27 is a farewell to Galatea who is starting off on a sea trip suggests at once, of course, the farewell to Vergil in the first book. That poem, like this, begins with a direct prayer for safety. Both poems turn next to the immediate scene of possible storms for the voyager about to set out and each poem ends with a more remote reverie on mythical parallels. In the earlier poem, to be sure, the parallels led the poet into a philosophizing mood whereas in the latter the myth controls the interest. In general, however, the technique is sufficiently similar to make one hesitate about turning to the dithyramb of Simonides for anything more than subject matter, and when we turn to subject matter another question arises that does not seem to have been sufficiently considered and which is at first rather disconcerting.

The Europa stanzas (ll. 25-76) are, as suggested above, an outgrowth of the scene as depicted by Horace in the earlier stanzas. They are somewhat out of proportion with their setting, and they have a unity in themselves which is lacking in the poem as a whole. In contrast with the first part of the poem they have some brilliant phrases and the succession of pictures presented in them is wholly effective. On closer scrutiny, however, the curious fact emerges that the story presented is not in accord with the accepted myth of Europa.

Ovid in Latin literature and Moschus in the Greek are the only writers that have left us surviving accounts of any completeness of the great adventure of Zeus and Europa. The two are in agreement so far as the essentials of the story are concerned. The Phoenician maiden picking flowers with the other girls of her own age in a meadow not far from the sea is approached by a beautiful white bull that shows every sign of friendliness and that wins the confidence of the blossom-gatherers. Europa in particular is won by his almost affectionate actions and, more venturesome than the other girls, she finally seats herself on his broad back as he kneels before her in the meadow. Thereupon the bull arises and makes for the seashore. Straight on over the waters he proceeds with miraculous ease while Europa clings with one hand to his horn and with the other holds her draperies out of the waves. The inhabitants of the ocean rise to hail his passage, and Europa, at first alarmed but then realizing the supernatural character of her strange cruise, asks of the bull his true identity. He com-

forts her with the disclosure that he is Zeus himself in disguise and that he will take her to Crete in safety. There as his consort she becomes the happy mother of Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Sarpedon.

None of the other references to Europa in our extant texts gives any essential variation from this story, which in spite of minor differences in detail and emphasis is the same in the Greek and Latin versions. No source, that is, except this ode of Horace. Horace devotes two stanzas only to the capture of Europa and her removal over the sea. The meadow, the flower-gathering, the deceit of Jupiter, and the departure over the waters of the sea are merely suggested in eight rapid lines. The moment of departure seized on for telling the story is that in which the maiden finds herself at night in mid-ocean brave but terrified. In the following stanza she lands in Crete, but there is no mention any longer of the bull as present in the scene. In fact, it is implied later on that he is not there at all. Quite obviously she is abandoned by the animal that has so miraculously brought her to the distant island. She bursts at once into a long complaint which is the most extensive element of the poem. She bemoans the fact that she has betrayed her father; the madness of love has triumphed over filial devotion. Death would be a light penalty for her fault. She finds it hard to believe that she is awake rather than dreaming. Was not the simple joy of picking flowers better than this mad adventure? She could now hate the false bull that she trusted so light-heartedly. She would prefer to perish at the mercy of wild beasts sooner than have her beauty waste away in this deserted spot. Her father, she believes, would bid her kill herself at once unless she prefers to become the handmaiden of some barbarian mistress. At this point her lament is interrupted by the arrival of Venus and Cupid. Venus laughs at her, and then tells her that it is Jupiter himself who has carried her off and that she is blessed indeed and must learn to bear her great good fortune, which includes the naming of a whole continent after her.

All this material in Horace, except the barest suggestion of the actual story in the first two stanzas, is foreign to the Europa myth. Nowhere else is there any suggestion of her desertion by the bull or of her ignorance after arriving in Crete of the identity of her lover. The motive of an abandoned mistress and her lament is not a part of this particular story as we have it from other sources but is a striking

parallel to the Ariadne myth as told by Catullus in the sixty-fourth poem. His heroine has been carried away by her lover from Crete and stands deserted on the seashore of Dia while Theseus sails away for Athens forgetful of his love. Ariadne complains at length of her hard fate. She has actually been asleep when Theseus left her, and her confusion is more natural than that of Europa. Each of the two heroines is grieved by the thought that her passion for a stranger has led her into unfilial action which must incur the anger of her father. To the mind of each comes the thought of the possibility of death by the violence of wild animals, although the expression of Europa's distress is more in the nature of a rhetorical figure than of a real terror. Each is comforted at the end with divine marriage, Ariadne by the arrival of Bacchus with his attendant troupe of revelers, Europa through the reassuring words of Venus accompanied by the friendly Cupid.

At once, of course, the thought arises that the case of a maiden leaving her father's home to go off with her lover is not uncommon in ancient mythology and that the most frequent sequel is abandonment and lament. In fact, if such tragedy does not follow the amorous adventure, there is little enough motive for a myth at all. The *Ciris* commemorates a similar experience of Scylla. Medea is in reality another maiden who meets tragedy in the same way and so is Io. But the lament on the seashore and the nature both of the lament and of the final comfort are individualistic details justifying a closer examination of the two texts.

One thing seems certain at the outset. The first six stanzas of Horace's ode are different from the last thirteen in that they do not show any reminiscences of the sixty-fourth poem of Catullus that might be expected, in view of the comparison already drawn, with the possible exception of the first word *impios*. This is a word not unusual in Catullus, and it occurs twice in the sixty-fourth poem; but there are some twenty instances of the word in Horace, and it would be impossible with propriety to suspect him of borrowing it from his predecessor. It is true also—though not, I think, of any importance—that the word *serpens* occurs in the sixty-fourth of Catullus, but the significant words in the first six stanzas of Horace's ode, the words that are rare in the rest of his work, and these are rather numerous, do not occur in Catullus. These are such words as *parrae*, *praegnans*, *rava*,

*lupa, feta, per obliquum, mannos, providus, auspex, picus, oscinem, and cornix.*¹ Certainly no one could claim the slightest Catullan influence for these six stanzas.

With line 26 there seems to be a change. *Niveum* is not unique in Horace but it is rare, occurring only four times. Catullus uses it eight times, and four of these instances are in the sixty-fourth poem. *Palluit* is also curiously rare in Horace, appearing but four times altogether and only here in the *Odes*. Catullus does not use it, but in lxiv. 100 he does use *expalluit*. These are not compelling parallels, and it is to be noted that the two stanzas in which they occur are really preliminary to the lament. They contain the summary of the story of Europa which is not parallel to the Ariadne myth, especially that part of it which contains the desertion and the lament. The following stanza, which begins the part of the Europa story (as told by Horace) that is suggestive of the Ariadne tale, begins *Quae simul centum tetigit potentem*. The *quae simul* cannot but suggest the similar opening of line 31 in Catullus lxiv, and it is strikingly significant that *tetigit* used of the landing of a ship on the shore or in the other poem of the landing of the bull at Crete occurs only here in Horace and is found also in Catullus lxiv. 172. In line 34 Europa in despair exclaims *Pater—O relictum filiae nomen pietasque . . . victa furore*. Ariadne (Catullus lxiv. 180 ff.) thinks of the impossibility of returning to her father and cries *An patris auxilium sperem, quemne ipsa reliqui*, etc. The use of *furore* for the passion of love is not common in Horace, occurring in only one other instance (*Satires* ii. 3. 325), but it is used three times in the sixty-fourth poem of Catullus (ll. 54, 94, 179).

Fluctus (l. 42), *iuvencum* (l. 45), and *cornua* and *monstri* (l. 48) are not actually rare Horatian words, but *iuvencum* is not perhaps the natural word for the mature Jupiter, *monstrum* occurs only three other times in Horace, and none of them is common. All these words appear in Catullus lxiv. The same is true of *praedae* (l. 55) in the sense of a female victim, so used also of Ariadne (lxiv. 153), and of *rupes* (l. 61), *procellae* (l. 62), *barbara* (l. 66), *perfidus* (l. 67), and *invicti* (l. 73). All these are used by Catullus in lxiv. Individually they are hardly significant but their number is striking. I have already quoted

¹ These are unique in Horace except *mannos, providus, auspex*, and *cornix*, which occur three times each.

patris . . . quemne ipsa reliqui (Catullus lxiv. 180), which might be echoed by line 49 of Horace, *impudens liqui patrios penates*. The simple form *liqui* for *reliqui* should be noted in passing. Ariadne complains that Theseus might have taken her as a household slave even if he did not want her for his wife (lxiv. 160), while Europa imagines her father warning her of just such a fate (ll. 63 ff.).

The case with *laceranda* (l. 71) (also *lacerare*, l. 46) is different. This word occurs in but one other instance in Horace, in *Odes* iii. 11. 42, the only ode which offers a parallel to the one under discussion in the sense that it consists essentially of a myth introduced by a setting consisting of a contemporary incident. The word does not actually occur in Catullus, but the compound *dilaceranda* does occur, and in the sixty-fourth poem (l. 152). Again *dedat* (l. 64) is unique for Horace, but occurs four times in Catullus, once in poem lxiv. Perhaps, however, the most significant single word is *singultus* in line 74. This is its only appearance in Horace although he has *singultim* in the more proper sense of stammering. But Catullus in lxiv. 131 uses *singultus* of the sobs of Ariadne just as Horace uses it for the similar sobs of Europa. Finally, I think there is some significance in the unusual use of *carpere pensum* in line 64 in view of the phrase in Catullus lxiv. 310, *carpebant rite laborem*. The very variation would in a later writer such as Tacitus be in itself an indication of conscious borrowing as would also the use of simple verbs for compounds that I have already noted.

This sort of imitation, if imitation it be, with such variation as to give the later writer a just claim to originality, is familiar in Latin literature but has hardly been considered characteristic of Horace. Its appearance here in this particular ode raises the more general question of Horace's relation to Catullus.

Catullus had various appellations for his poems, some of them used without exactitude but some apparently chosen with care. *Carmen* is the term employed by him for his own Peleus and Thetis poem (lxiv. 24, 116), for the song of the *Parcae* which is part of the same (lxiv. 321, 322, 383), for his own elegiac sixty-eighth (lxviii. 149), for a priestly incantation (xc. 5), for a wedding song (lxi. 13), and finally for certain of his own and the earlier Greek productions which require a further word. These last seem to be of an elegiac nature. They are

the songs of mourning that he expects to write because of his brother's death (lxv. 12) and those in imitation of Callimachus, the *carmina Battiadae* (lxv. 16 and cxvi. 2).

A second fairly definite group of poems is spoken of by Catullus as *hendecasyllabi* (xii. 10 and xlii. 1) and *iambi* (xxxvi. 5; xl. 2; liv. 6; frag. 1). These are all vituperative, or at least there is in the terms as he uses them the implication of attack. The hendecasyllables were employed, however, in a more general way, and one of these to Calvus, of a most friendly tone, Catullus refers to as *poema* (l. 16).

Aside from these terms, Catullus used *nugae* (i. 4), *versus* (vi. 17), *ineptiae* (xivb. 1), and *versiculi* (xvi. 3 and l. 4), and also in referring to the writing of light verse with Calvus expressed the process as *multum lusimus in meis tabellis* (l. 2). All this implies a variety perhaps—certainly a lack of strict classification by type—which is confirmed by the fact that Catullus never uses such terms as *elegia* or *lyricus*. Twice only did he experiment with the Sapphic stanza (xi and li) and twice with the Glyconic (xxxiv and lxi).

It seems a safe conclusion that Catullus did not think of himself as a lyric poet in the sense of being a successor of the great Greek lyricists. His more careful and studied work was in the realm of epyllion and elegy; his shorter poems he would hardly have called lyrics except for the two in Sapphic stanzas, and he would hardly have quarreled with Martial, who looked to him as his master in the epigram.

It is therefore strange that criticism has always been inclined to find in Horace's proud claim, *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos*, a snub for Catullus. Horace did not deny to the earlier writer anything that Catullus would have claimed for himself. The Augustan poet did announce himself in his first ode as an aspirant for lyric honors in the field of Alcaeus and Sappho, and his claim to have attained the first and greatest Roman success in this field is no disparagement of Catullus. Ovid did not include Catullus in the list of his predecessors (*Tristia* iv. 10. 53), although he was an admirer of Catullus and in spite of the fact that Catullus was one of the earliest writers of elegy. For, while he wrote elegy, and that too in imitation of the Alexandrians, the recognized type of erotic elegy was a later crystallization. The same, in a general way, is true of his lyrics. In

other words, if we are to classify Catullus we must agree with Hendrickson² that he was an imitator of the Alexandrians and perhaps the first. But he was by no means slavish in his imitation, nor did he go far enough in any one line to be more than a pioneer. He did not work with fixed types. Cicero's sneer at the singers of Euphron was a sneer at the followers of Catullus who made a cult of Alexandrianism with a distinctly academic tone with which it is not easy to associate Catullus himself. It is hard not to believe that Horace, too, aimed his shafts at the tasteless imitators of the pioneer without intending them for Catullus. His claim to be the first great Roman lyricist would probably never have been thought of as an affront to Catullus if it had not been for his one definite reference to his Veronese predecessor. This is generally taken to be derogatory. Horace is discussing satire and his own relation to Lucilius, in *Satire* i. 10, and in particular the point that Lucilius, while successful in caustic criticism, was deficient in polish, variety, and subtle wit. He cites the writers of the Old Comedy as superior to Lucilius in these respects and says that Hermogenes never read them nor did that "ape" who was clever only in imitating Calvus and Catullus. The ape may be Demetrius or any one of the group of contemporaries whose work Horace decries; he specifies later Hermogenes, Demetrius, Pantilius, and Fannius. His chief criticism of them is that they are not willing to apply the study and care necessary to make their work really great rather than merely popular; he himself prefers to appeal to the connoisseur. It is not entirely fair to assume any criticism of Calvus and Catullus, for all that is actually said is that their imitator goes only to them and not back to the Greek masterpieces. If criticism is implied at all, it might be like the criticism of Lucilius, confined to one point, in this instance that Calvus and Catullus were not careful students of the best Greeks so much as brilliant writers of incidental verse, with superficial knowledge of the Alexandrians.

It is far from my purpose to question the fact of Horace's hostility to the group represented by Valerius Cato or the grounds of that hostility as presented by Hendrickson. But Catullus was the virile pioneer to whom that group laid claim rather than actually a member of it, and Horace might deprecate such traits in the work of Catullus

² *Class. Phil.*, XII, 239 ff.

as, in later imitators, led to what he considered degenerate results, without scorning the work as a whole. In his very borrowings he eliminated Graecisms of which he disapproved and undoubtedly sought to show that he could improve on his model, but the very extent to which he borrowed seems indication enough that he was criticizing details rather than condemning the writer *in toto* as member of an uncongenial school.

If Horace had meant more than this it is hard to see why he should have borrowed without concealment from the two Sapphic experiments of Catullus. None of his contemporaries could have failed to recognize the *dulce ridentem* of i. 22. 23 as coming from Catullus (li. 5) or the *ultimos Britannos* of i. 35. 29 as also Catullan (from xi. 9, 10), while most of them must have recognized as well that the repeated use of *otium* at the beginning of the line in ii. 16 came from Catullus li, and the *sive—sive* in connection with distant voyaging in i. 22 from Catullus xi. These unconcealed borrowings are sufficient to indicate that Horace looked upon the two Sapphic poems of Catullus as work worthy of recognition even while introducing improvements, nor is such recognition inconsistent with his attitude toward the earlier poet.³

If once it is admitted that Horace felt no contempt for Catullus, it is no longer surprising to find him going to his predecessor for suggestions. The reverse, as a matter of fact, would be the surprising thing to discover. That Horace was an earnest student of literature goes without saying, and while it is true that he went by preference to the greater Greek poets, it would be hard to believe that he ignored the best in Catullus any more than in Lucretius.

The resemblance between the twenty-seventh ode in Book iii and the eleventh in the same book has already been noted. This is a resemblance in technique. The myth contained in the eleventh is not one that was treated by Catullus, and there is therefore no reason to look for the close imitation that seemed to exist in the twenty-seventh. Nor would one expect to find the sharp distinction between the stanzas

³ The somewhat less obvious use of Catullus xi by Horace in *Odes* ii. 6 should be noted. The idea of willingness to accompany the writer to any distant spot is common to the opening verses of the two poems, expressed in the one by *comites* and a future tense, in the other by *aditure mecum*. The closing line of the first stanza in Catullus is *tunditur unda*; in Horace, *aestuat unda*.

that give the setting and those that tell the myth. Nevertheless it seems like more than a coincidence that in the comparatively few lines (20) that tell the myth of Hypermnestra the following words occur which appear also in the sixty-fourth poem of Catullus and are at the same time not very common in Horace: *lympha*, *periurus*, *splendidus*, *lacerant*, *faveo*, *querella* and *clemens*, with the following more common Horatian words that are also in Catullus lxiv, *sepulcrum*, *memor*, *parco*, and *extremus*. There are also other words rare in Horace that are found in other poems of Catullus such as *faces*, *nuptialia*, *claustra*, and *omine*—all of which occur in the sixty-first of Catullus. In the earlier introductory stanzas *resonare* (Catullus lxiv. 273 and xi. 3) is striking, occurring only one other time in the *Odes*. *Expers* (Catullus lxiv. 338 and lxvi. 77 and 91), *taeter* (Catullus lx. 3 and lxxvi. 25), and *mulces* (Catullus lxii. 41) occur only once each in the *Odes*.

An equally good if not a better case appears for Catullan reminiscence in the fourteenth ode of Book i. This is particularly interesting because of the difficulty in interpreting the ode itself and because of the tradition originating with Quintilian that it is allegorical, and the belief surviving all difficulties that Horace had in mind fragment 18 of Alcaeus when he wrote this fourteenth ode. There seems to have developed a more or less general belief, too, that the fragment of Alcaeus is also allegorical. This seems rather hard to substantiate, and we know from Horace that Alcaeus wrote of the literal hardships of the ocean. In view, therefore, of the slender thread by which Horace's ode is attached to the Greek fragment, it is not so surprising to find more tangible relations with Catullus. The number of significant words in this ode occurring also in the sixty-fourth of Catullus is decidedly striking: *malus* (a mast) *saucius*, *antemnae*, *funis*, *carinae*, *fluctus*, *nudus* (stripped of), *portus*, *lintea*, *pinus*, *navita*, and *puppis*. Here are twelve words in twenty lines. *Fluctus* and *navita* are not, to be sure, uncommon in Horace, and *pinus* without the present connotation occurs some six times. *Antemnae* is unique for the Augustan poet and *carina* occurs in two other instances. The rest of these occur once each aside from the present instance.

There is another striking word in the ode which may come from Catullus, namely, *desiderium*, used to express the object of desire

rather than the emotion and so used by Catullus in ii. 5 with the adjectival participle *nitens*, which is also employed in the present poem by Horace but most inappropriately to describe the Cyclades in the midst of a raging storm. The islands are of course represented in iii. 28. 13 as the home of Venus, and the epithet there is *fulgentes*. The islands themselves may have been suggested by the fourth poem of Catullus. Certainly in this fourteenth ode the Cyclades are one of the difficulties of interpretation. Why does Horace choose the Aegean Sea? If, however, he borrowed his location from the fourth poem of Catullus, it would explain also *Pontica* as the source of his ship timber and *silva* as the same as well as the use of *nobilis* in a rather unusual sense, all of which appear both in Horace i. 14 and in Catullus iv.

I have noted only two other odes of Horace that seem clearly to be extensively affected by Catullan vocabulary—the fourth and thirty-second of Book i. Ode i. 4 opens with a reference to the wind *Favonius*, a Roman wind which Catullus used in lxiv. 281; in the next line occurs the rather uncommon *carinae*, and in lines 3 and 4 are two words unique in Horace, *stabulis* and *albicant*, which appear in Catullus lxiii. 53 and 87. *Canus* is not common in Horace and does occur in Catullus lxiv. 18. These first four lines have also *arator* and *prata*, both of which Catullus uses in xi. 22, familiar to Horace. In Catullus lxiii. 30 we find *chorus*, *properante pede*, and *viridi*, with *gravis* a few lines above, while here in line 5 we have *choros*, in line 7 *alterno pede* and *gravis*, and in line 9 *viridi*. *Pallida mors*, in line 13, suggests *pallidus* and *pallidulum* of Catullus lxxxi. 4 and lxxv. 6, both of which have the connotation of death, and this is the only occurrence of *pallidus* in the *Odes*. *Tabernae* in line 13 is also unique for the *Odes*, and is found in Catullus xxxvi. 15 and xxvii. 1 and 10. It is not probable, but possible, that *regum* and *beata* in the same line may have been suggested to Horace by Catullus li. 15, *Otium et reges prius et beatas perdidit urbes*, while *premet* in its present sense is found in Catullus lxvi. 69. Finally, *talis*, unique in the *Odes*, may come from Catullus lxiv. 305.

Ode i. 32 begins with *vacui lusimus*, which cannot but suggest *otiosi lusimus* in Catullus l. 1 and 2, and, in the same line, *sub umbra* brings to mind *sub umbris* of Catullus lxxv. 13. In line 2 it is interesting to compare *quod et hunc in annum vivat et pluris* with Catullus i. 9:

quod, o patrona virgo, plus uno maneat perenne saeclo. Added interest is given to this reminiscence by Hendrickson's suggestion that i. 32 was perhaps the *prooemium* to an earlier volume.⁴ In line 3 *age dic* suggests *dic agedum* (Catullus lxvii. 7) and in line 5 *primum* is used adverbially as in Catullus lxiv. 56. *Religarat* (l. 7) is more surely an echo of *religasset* (Catullus lxiv. 174); in line 11, *nigris oculis* recalls *nigris ocellis* of Catullus xliii. 2; and in the last line of the ode, *rite* sounds like a borrowing from Catullus lxiv. 310.

Something of a case might be made for Ode i. 34, in the second stanza of which Jupiter is presented wielding his thunderbolt, *quo bruta tellus et vaga flumina . . . concutitur*. In lxiv. 205, Catullus depicts Jupiter with his official nod: *quo nutu tellus atque horrida contremuerunt aequora, concussitque micantia sidera mundus*. The fourth stanza, too, has various Catullan words: *attenuat* (lxiv. 41), *stridore* (*stridebat*, lxiv. 264), *acuto* (of a sound, as in lxiii. 24), *obscura* (lxiv. 259), and *rapax* (lxiv. 156).

The remaining reminiscences of Catullus that I have noted are more incidental and scattered. The following comparisons are worth citing: Odes i. 1. 13, *trabe* (of a ship, as in Catullus iv. 3); i. 1. 36, *vertice* (of the head, as frequently in lxiv and lxvi); i. 3. 4, *truci pelago*, and Catullus lxiii. 16, *truculentaque pelagi*; i. 16. 5 and Catullus lxiii. 13 and 91: *Dindymene*; possibly i. 16. 18, *ultimae causae*, and Catullus iv. 5, *ultima ex origine*; ii. 7. 1, *tempus in ultimum*, and Catullus lxiv. 150, *supremo in tempore*; ii. 16. 1, *in patenti prensus Aegaeo*, and Catullus xxv. 12, *in magno mari deprensa*; ii. 20. 9, *iam, iam*, and the same in Catullus lxii. 52 and lxiii. 73; iii. 13, *gelidos* (cf. Catullus lxiii. 53), *vomere tauris* (cf. *vomere taurus*, Catullus lxiv. 40), *pecori vago* (cf. *vaga pecora*, Catullus lxiii. 13), *lymphae* (cf. Catullus lxiv. 162); iii. 15. 10, *concita . . . tympano*, and Catullus lxiii. 9, *citata* with *tympano* in close juxtaposition; iii. 15. 15, *opaca*, used of words as in Catullus lxiii. 3; iii. 26. 12, *tange flagello*, and Catullus lxii. 52, *flagellum contingit*; iii. 29. 17, *ostendit ignes*, and the same in Catullus lxii. 7. *Satires* ii. 6. 102, the details of the rich house of the city mouse, have tantalizing resemblances to those of the couch in Catullus lxiv. 45, 47, and 265; *Epistles* ii. 1. 45, of a far distant voyage, *extremos*

⁴ *Op. cit.*, XXVI, 1 ff.

curris ad Indos, and the same sort of hypothetical voyage in Catullus xi. 2, *in extremos penetrabit Indos*.

It seems fairly apparent that in certain poems Horace had Catullus definitely in mind as he wrote. Aside from these four or five odes, his reminiscences are scattered and not very numerous. Except for the Ariadne episode, he evidently did not go to the earlier poet for subject matter so much as for effective vocabulary and to a certain extent for phrases. He was careful to vary, and if possible to improve, any phrases that he borrowed, and he made a practice of using a simple verb in the place of a borrowed compound. It remains to note the poems of Catullus that particularly interested him.

Out of something over a hundred possible reminiscences that I have noted, more than half are from the sixty-fourth poem, from which, of course, comes also the Ariadne incident. This epyllion Horace must have known thoroughly as there is hardly a passage of twenty lines in it from which he did not glean at least a word. Of the other long poems only lxi and lxiii interested him to anything more than a trifling extent, nor are his borrowings from lxi impressive. The conviction persists, however, with regard to lxiii that he knew this poem well, for he shows his familiarity by some nine echoes and these come from all parts of the *Attis*. I have noticed only seven borrowings from the much longer sixty-first and only three from sixty-two. Of the short poems there can be no doubt that he was chiefly interested in the two Sapphics, xi and li, for although there are more actual borrowings from the early lines of iv, they are less significant. Poem iv seems to be the only one of the non-stanzaic short poems that he honored to any extent with imitation.

YALE COLLEGE
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

SCRUTINY AND APPEAL IN ATHENIAN CITIZENSHIP

BY AUBREY DILLER

IN A previous issue of this periodical,¹ Professor A. W. Gomme, of Glasgow, paid me the honor of criticizing a paper on the decree of Demophilus in 346/5 B.C. which I had read before the American Philological Association in December, 1932.² Professor Gomme attempts, without success it seems to me, to overthrow my construction of the evidence; and I think the problem may profitably be discussed further in view of his criticism.

It is agreed that in 346/5 B.C. the Athenian assembly decreed on the motion of one Demophilus that there should be a general scrutiny of all those enrolled in the registers of the demes to determine whether they were legitimate citizens or not. Each deme was to scrutinize its own members, and a rejected member might appeal to a court if he wished to contest the verdict of the deme. I began my argument by saying that this act of the assembly was only a temporary measure and that it was impossible that such a process should be perpetuated by a standing law. Gomme begins by objecting that there must have been a standing law to make the procedure legal at all, that is, a law enabling an extraordinary general scrutiny to be held when the assembly voted for one. It is true that decrees of the assembly were subject to the laws, but only negatively. They were bound not to be inconsistent with them, but not bound to be specifically authorized by them. This is plainly the tenor of the *γραφὴ παρανόμων*, to which Gomme refers, and it is borne out by many recorded instances, in none of which is a decree indicted because it was not authorized by a standing law.³ The Athenian assembly was a sovereign body and its powers could not have been so limited. The decree of Demophilus would have been legally impossible only if it was inconsistent with some existing law, and no such law is known.

¹ *Class. Phil.*, XXIX (1934), 123-40.

² *TAPA*, LXIII (1932), 193-205.

³ Lipsius, *Das attische Recht* (1905-15), pp. 309-96.

A standing law such as Gomme supposes, enabling the assembly to decree a general scrutiny, would imply that there were other general scrutinies besides that of Demophilus. Unless the law were in an original constitution, a decree would surely have followed directly upon its first passing, since the state would scarcely have desired the law itself without desiring to put it into effect. Now a general scrutiny of all the citizens of Athens was a great thing, as our sources vividly portray. It was laborious for the demes, it aroused scandals and animosities, it certified or disqualified the birth record of every citizen, it crowded the courts and cost money for juries. Such an affair could not have been repeated at close intervals, and when it did occur it attracted much attention. Yet the general scrutiny of 346/5 is the only one authentically attested, and it is attested as the only one by Dionysius Halic.⁴ and Harpocration.⁵ The case in Dem. lvii occurred in a general scrutiny, and most scholars have assumed that it was the scrutiny of 346/5. Gomme⁶ questions this assumption, and it is true that aside from the scrutiny the evidence of date in Dem. lvii is vague. We can only say that the speaker was born early in the fourth century and that he is now of middle age, having been phratriarch, demarch, and nominee for a priesthood (23, 62, 63). Any date between 360 and 340 is possible, though the extremes are improbable. However, in Dem. lvii. 8, a sister of one Lacedaemonius is mentioned incidentally, and in Dem. lix. 45 one Satyrus of Alopece is identified as a brother of Lacedaemonius. Who Lacedaemonius was we do not know, but apparently both passages refer to some person who happened to be before the public eye at the moment. His very obscurity argues that his prominence was short-lived. Dem. lix is dated about 343 and Dem. lvii cannot then have been many years earlier. This evidence brings the probable date of Dem. lvii so close to 346/5 as to preclude the possibility of another general scrutiny to which it might be referred. The speaker of Dem. lvii is defending his citizenship, and he cites in detail all the occasions on which either he or his father had been officially recognized as citizens (62). There is no mention of their ever having passed a general scrutiny, and Gomme himself⁷ infers from this silence that there cannot have been one since the father was in the registers. The period in which a general scrutiny is thus precluded

⁴ *Dinarch.* 11.

⁵ *S.v.* διαψήφισις.

⁶ *P.* 126.

⁷ *P.* 126, n. 8.

extends from the early fourth century to the date of the speech itself, that is, to 346/5.

In the early part of the fourth century the law of citizenship in Athens was in a temporary state, as is shown by the decree of one Nicomenes cited by the scholiast on Aesch. i. 39: *μηδένα τῶν μετ' Εὐκλείδην ἄρχοντα μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ἂν μὴ ἄμφω τοὺς γονέας ἀστούς ἐπιδείξηται, τοὺς δὲ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξετάστους ἀφείσθαι*. The interpretation of this decree is elucidated by a statement in Dem. lvii. 30, where the speaker says of his father: *τοῖς χρόνοις τοίνυν οὕτω φαίνεται γεγονώς, ὥστ' εἰ καὶ κατὰ θάτερον ἀστὸς ἦν, εἶναι πολίτην προσήκειν αὐτόν· γέγονεν γὰρ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου*. This statement proves the authenticity of the decree of Nicomenes and shows that the exception applied to persons born as well as to persons of age before 403/2. Persons born after 403/2, to whom the law applied in full force, would not come up for admission into the demes until 385/4. Before that year persons of half-Athenian parentage were admitted freely. These were the people who must have caused most of the corruption in Athenian citizenship. The tension between citizens and aliens was further relaxed at this time on account of the war, which had reduced the population, both native and foreign, and made the state less scrupulous about citizenship.⁸ Moreover, the decree of Nicomenes was apparently a part of the general amnesty proclaimed at the restoration of 403, with which a general scrutiny would have been inconsistent in practice even more than in theory, since it gave vent to political animosities. Under such circumstances there would be little reason for and strong reason against a general scrutiny. I find it impossible to suppose, therefore, that one occurred between the overthrow of the Thirty and the year 385, and since the subsequent period is covered by Dem. lvii, I regard it as certain that there was no general scrutiny between 403 and 346. The hypothetical law, enabling the assembly to decree a general scrutiny, and the precedent for such a decree, if they existed prior to 346, must have been revived from the fifth century after a lapse of at least fifty-seven years.

During the greater part of the fifth century the situation of citizenship in Athens was much the same as between 403 and 385. In 451/0 the law of Pericles was passed which for the first time made Athenian

⁸ Isocr. viii. 21. 88.

parentage on both sides requisite for citizenship.⁹ This law was surely not retroactive, but applied, like the law in the decree of Nicomenes, only to persons born after its passing, who would not come up for registration in the demes until 433/2. Before that year a person could base his claim to citizenship on one parent only. Such a claim is simpler, more demonstrable, and less liable to fraud than the claim based on both parents. Moreover, when the Periclean law was passed, Athenian society was just becoming aware of the complications arising from the large class of resident aliens, which it had acquired as a result of the naval empire, still less than thirty years old. The new law was doubtless its response to the new situation. The elaborate procedure of a general scrutiny is incongruous with the early period in which the requirements of citizenship were simple and the pressure of foreigners was small. A scheme of organic development would place the origin of such a device at an advanced point in the history of Athenian citizenship, at least after the Periclean law, which it seems designed to enforce, was passed and had become effective, that is, after 433/2.

The period between 433 and 403 was occupied largely by the long war with Sparta, and a general scrutiny was neither practicable nor desirable while hostilities continued, although one might have occurred during the Peace of Nicias. But this whole period is covered fairly well by contemporary sources in Thucydides, Aristophanes, Andocides, Lysias, Xenophon, Plato, and the remains of Old Comedy and the inscriptions. A general scrutiny was a sufficiently large affair to make the total silence of all these sources a strong argument against its having occurred. Therefore, while the evidence is not as conclusive for the fifth century as for the fourth, I think the balance of probability inclines decidedly in favor of the presumption that there was no general scrutiny during this period either and that the decree of Demophilus in 346/5 was entirely without precedent.

Aside from the decree of Demophilus and the alleged *διαψηφισμός* in 510 B.C.,¹⁰ which Gomme¹¹ agrees is not authentic, the nearest suggestion of a general scrutiny in all Athenian history is in connection with the grain doles which on more than one occasion during the fifth century were distributed to the citizens in time of famine. One such

⁹ Arist. *Ath.* 26.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 13.

¹¹ Pp. 139 f.

occasion in 445/4 is recounted by Philochorus¹² and Plutarch,¹³ who emphasize the fact that many false citizens were exposed at this time; but their account is worthless for reconstructing the process by which citizenship was decided. Aristophanes describes a similar dole in 422, of which he says, *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ξενίας φεύγων ἔλαβες*.¹⁴ There are three possibilities of procedure, according as the citizenship of the applicant was decided before, or after, or at the same time as he claimed the dole. If it was before, a general scrutiny would be a possible procedure; if after, the *γραφὴ ξενίας*. It is impossible that both of these procedures took place, as Gomme¹⁵ supposes, since the *γραφὴ* implies a false claim, while a scrutiny would have forestalled a false claim. On the other hand, the expression *ξενίας φεύγων* is probably a comic hyperbole scarcely to be taken literally as signifying that the *γραφὴ ξενίας* was the regular procedure, as I had formerly supposed. Rather the present participle suggests some kind of dispute between the applicant and the magistrate who distributed the dole and was responsible for giving it to the right persons. In any case the grain doles are not proof of general scrutinies.

A general scrutiny applied to every citizen of previous standing once and for all. It is not to be confused with the particular scrutinies of new citizens as they came of age, which Aristotle¹⁶ describes. These were perpetual; the other was occasional. While the decree of Demophilus was, as I think, the only occasion on which a general scrutiny ever occurred, there were particular scrutinies both before and after that occasion. The origin of this process is naturally more obscure than that of the great general scrutiny. In my previous paper I cited all the evidence I could find and remarked that the process appears earliest in a *γένος*,¹⁷ that in the decrees of the Deceleans in 396/5¹⁸ it seems to be passing from a *γένος* to a phratry, and that soon after it appears in a deme.¹⁹ The view that this was actually the order of development, which Gomme²⁰ calls singularly perverse and attributes to me, was not expressed in my paper. My view is that the develop-

¹² *Sch. Ar. Vesp.* 718.

¹³ *Per.* 37.

¹⁴ *Vesp.* 718.

¹⁵ *P.* 135, n. 23, and p. 140.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* 42.

¹⁷ *Andoc.* i. 127.

¹⁸ *IG*, II², 1237.

¹⁹ *Dem.* lvii. 62.

²⁰ *P.* 137.

ment was simultaneous, though gradual, in all three bodies, and that it was voluntary, irregular, and sporadic on their part. It would be instructive to know what parallels for this form of admission to a closed group could be found among other early peoples. My own impression is that the process is rare, and I regard its development in Athens as a consequence of the Periclean law, which so complicated the requirements for citizenship.

A negative verdict in a scrutiny by a γένος, phratry, or deme prejudiced, if not actually abrogated, the hereditary and civil rights of the applicant and consequently came within the jurisdiction of the state and its courts. It was possible for a rejected applicant to sue all three of these bodies to compel them to recognize his rights if he thought his claim was strong enough to be sustained by a court. Two such suits are known to us, one against a γένος²¹ and one against a deme.²² Both came before arbitrators and were consequently private suits. In Dem. lvii. 60 the speaker tells of rejected demesmen being "accepted again by the court," and we may assume that these cases were similar private suits. Such suits were initial actions, not appeals, because appeals are made from previous official acts, while the γένη and phratries could not make official acts since they were not official bodies. The demes, indeed, were official bodies, but this does not necessarily differentiate suits against them which were in other respects similar to those against the γένη. Gomme²³ is mistaken, therefore, when he cites these cases as proving that there had been appeals from scrutinies in demes a long time before the decree of Demophilus.

However, in the general scrutiny described by Dionysius Halic.²⁴ and Libanius²⁵ which must be the one prescribed by the decree of Demophilus in 346/5, and also in the particular scrutinies described by Aristotle,²⁶ it was possible for a rejected applicant to appeal from the deme to a court. The distinction between these appeals and the private suits just referred to is the most important point in this discussion. The appeals came before the θεσμοθέται,²⁷ while the private suits came before the arbitrators and consequently, as Gomme admits

²¹ Dem. lix. 59 f.

²² Isaeus xii.

²³ P. 129, n. 13.

²⁴ Isaeus 16.

²⁵ Hypoth. Dem. 57.

²⁶ Op. cit. 42.

²⁷ Ibid. 59.

hesitatingly,²⁸ before the Forty. I attempted to show that the appeals were public cases, while the suits were private. Although Gomme²⁹ attacks the evidence, some of which is indeed not binding, he does not convince himself that the appeals were not public and avoids committing himself on this cardinal point at all. As a matter of fact, the appeals were public. Aristotle clearly associates them with public cases (γραφαί, δοκιμασίαι, καταγνώσεις) and opposes them to δίκαι ἴδιαι under the θεσμοθέται. But the surest proof is the penalty. For the appellant from a deme might be sold as a slave if he lost his case (see below), whereas a private suit could not entail the loss of life, freedom, or rights, least of all for the plaintiff.³⁰ The appeals were therefore thoroughly different from the private suits and must not be identified with them by supposing a mere formal change such as the transference from one magistrate to another.³¹

In interpreting the appeal I sought to show that it was tried by the same process as the γραφή ξενίας and proposed that it was an adaptation of the γραφή. On this point Gomme arbitrarily dismisses important evidence, calling it deceptive.³² "Both classes of trial came before the thesmothetai"; he says,³³ "but there the resemblance ends." It does not end there. On the next page he alludes to the fact, which I had mentioned in the same sentence with the θεσμοθέται and which is too well attested to be denied, the fact, namely, that the penalty for the unsuccessful appellant was the same, viz., that his property should be confiscated and he should be sold as a slave. For whatever we make of Gomme's new version of this penalty,³⁴ the fact remains

²⁸ P. 127.

³¹ Gomme, p. 140.

²⁹ P. 128.

³² P. 139.

³⁰ Lipsius, pp. 244, 930.

³³ P. 129.

³⁴ I myself am unable to agree with this new version for the following reasons: (1) It depends chiefly on the unfortunate words ἀν μὲν ἀποφθίσωνται (MS ἐπι-) μὴ εἶναι ἐλεύθερον in Arist. *Ath.* 42; but it introduces greater difficulties in this passage than it solves. For the διαψήφισις was a yea-and-nay vote and could not specify μὴ εἶναι ἐλεύθερον or μὴ γεγονέναι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους. Any such division of cases must have taken place in the court. But this would be contrary to Aristotle's words, which introduce the division in the deme if at all. It is necessary, therefore, to take the words μὴ εἶναι ἐλεύθερον as both telescoped and pleonastic after ἀποφθίσωνται. (2) Dionysius and Libanius cannot be dependent on Aristotle, since they mention the appeal in a different connection. Their source was probably the *Atthis* cited by Harpocration (*s.v.* διαψήφισις), and they confirm Aristotle's account. (3) There was a sharp distinction between penalties fixed by law and penalties assessed by the court. Gomme's version

that, such as it was, it was the same in both the appeal and the *γραφή*. And with the same penalty and the same magistrate in trials of disputed citizenship, he cannot justly say he can find no grounds for believing me when I regard the two trials as equivalent. He does give some grounds for not believing me. The nature of the charge, he says,³⁵ is different in the appeal and the *γραφή*, because the *γραφή* was a charge of fraudulent usurpation of citizen rights, while the appeal was a mere question of legitimate birth without prejudice of fraud. But the crime of *ξενία*, to which the *γραφή* applied, is defined merely as usurpation of citizen rights and must have included all such violations, whether fraudulent or not.³⁶ Few laws could be enforced if prosecution were limited to fraudulent violation. On the other hand, the appeal did entail liability, since the appellant was penalized if he lost. The scrutiny in the deme did not entail liability; but when the rejected applicant after consideration persisted in his claim to citizenship by appealing to the court, he was not only claiming but actually using the rights of a citizen (access to court) and was liable to the penalty if his claim was not sustained. It seems to me, therefore, that the nature of the issue in the appeal and the *γραφή* was exactly the same; and this was of course the chief reason for associating the two processes.

Gomme also points out that the initiative in the appeal and the *γραφή* was on opposite sides. The *γραφή* was initiated by a voluntary accuser, while the appeal was introduced by the defendant voluntarily against the deme as accuser. But here again he arbitrarily rejects good evidence. The appellant did not summon (*προσκαλέομαι*) the demesmen as in an initial action, but challenged them (*προκαλέομαι*) in an action which they had already taken. For in spite of Gomme's

would make this penalty variable, whereas all the sources imply that it was fixed. (4) Gomme overestimates the severity of the penalty, which could easily be avoided by a concerted purchase and emancipation, as he himself suggests (p. 138). He also underestimates the responsibility of the appellant, who was not an unknowing child imposed upon by his guardians and the state, but a grown man fairly warned by the verdict of the deme. (5) The same penalty was inflicted on metics who failed to register with a patron and pay the metic tax (*ἀπροστασίον*: Dem. xxv. 57; Diog. Laert. iv. 14; Phot. Suid. *πωληται*). This was a negative usurpation of citizen rights, and here the defendant who was sold as a slave had necessarily been a free person.

³⁵ P. 130.

³⁶ Hesych. *ξενίας δίκη*; Sch. ad Dem. xxiv. 131.

denial,³⁷ this is the authentic reading in Dionys. *Isaeus* 16, as is plain from Usener and Radermacher's apparatus.³⁸ The verdict of the deme in the scrutiny automatically became equivalent to a *γραφὴ ξενίας* if it was contested in an appeal. The initiative was technically with the deme. This interpretation seems to me not only reasonable but necessary to explain the technical affinity between the appeal and the *γραφὴ*. However, the fact is not to be concealed that there was a difference in initiative. I never identified the appeal with the *γραφὴ*, but merely argued that it was handled by the same process. The essential difference is this: In the *γραφὴ* the initiative was voluntary on the part of the accuser and automatically entailed the liability of the defendant, while in the scrutiny and appeal the initiative was obligatory on the part of the deme and a negative verdict did not entail liability if it was not contested. The scrutiny and appeal were more just to the defendant. They were also more effective in preventing false citizenship, since the prosecution depended on a systematic and official examination of all citizens instead of a casual and personal suspicion of certain ones of them. This advantage was gained by grafting the *γραφὴ* on the scrutiny in the form of an appeal, which superseded the private suit against the deme.

The inception of this system occurred in the interval between the private suit in *Isaeus* xii and the public appeal in *Dem.* lvii. Its date is therefore not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, when *Isaeus* was writing, and not later than the decree of *Demophilus* in 346/5, when *Dem.* lvii was delivered. Gomme admits the dates and the differentiation of these two cases, although he minimizes the latter.³⁹ The main thesis of my paper was that the unique decree for a general scrutiny in 346/5 was intended to set this system afoot and was in fact a part of the same enactment that instituted the system itself. Gomme⁴⁰ objects that two such parts could not have been combined in a single enactment, apparently because one of them must have been a law (*νόμος*) and hence enacted by the *νομοθέται*, while the other was a decree (*ψήφισμα*) enacted by the assembly. But law and decree were not only confused verbally but actually overlapped in

³⁷ P. 129, n. 14.

³⁸ *Dionys. Halic. Opusc.*, I (Teubner, 1899), p. 115.

³⁹ Pp. 127, 140.

⁴⁰ P. 124.

practice, since it was possible to enact by decree what was virtually law and thus take a short-cut to legislation.⁴¹ Demosthenes⁴² complains that the function of the *νομοθέται* was largely usurped by politicians in the assembly. I suppose, therefore, that the new system was instituted by a single decree of the assembly on the motion of Demophilus which carried two provisions, one for the perpetual particular scrutinies and one for the immediate general scrutiny, both alike admitting the appeal which was the keystone of the whole institution. The enactment as I have reconstructed it is paralleled in the decrees of the Deccleans in 396/5,⁴³ which prescribed scrutinies and appeals within the phratry. The first decree clearly enacts both an immediate scrutiny of existing members (13-26) and regular scrutinies in the future for new members (26-45). While the constitution of a phratry was of course a different thing from that of the state of Athens, the parallel at least shows that this method of instituting the system was not foreign to contemporary legislation.

PARIS, FRANCE

⁴¹ Lipsius, pp. 385-88.

⁴² xx. 91 f.

⁴³ IG, II, 1237.

PARRESIASTIC POEMS OF HORACE

BY NORMAN W. DEWITT

BY THE time of Horace the various schools of philosophy, however much they continued to differ about the chief good, had come to approximate so closely to one another in certain phases of their practical ethics that attempts to trace lines of teaching are very difficult and not very useful. For instance, no school could well deny that a violent temper was an evil, calling for remedy; and so the title "De ira" was common to several. It was not so with *παρρησία*, "outspokenness," which was peculiar to the Epicureans as a corollary to their cardinal principle of friendship. If members of the school were to live together in friendly brotherhoods, it was, of course, essential that candor and frankness should prevail among them.

Friendship had been a principle of conduct among the Pythagoreans also, but it is doubtful whether they possessed the word *παρρησία*. The new Liddell and Scott quotes no example earlier than the great age of Athens, and apparently the Athenians coined the term to denote a virtue that they claimed for themselves. Plato and Aristotle both employ it but display no tendency to make a topic of it. It is not even featured in the extant remains of Epicurus and does not occur in the Index of Bailey's edition.¹ It may be taken as certain, however, that the founder enjoined free speaking, because we happen to be informed by Cicero that he condemned the use of irony.² The first to make a topic of it seems to have been Zeno of Sidon, who in his old age, in 78 B.C., had Cicero and Atticus among his auditors.³ It was a series of lectures (*σχολαί*) by him, entitled *περί παρρησίας*, that Philodemus epitomized in the time of Horace.⁴

Properly, *παρρησία* (*πᾶς ῥήσις*) meant frankness, outspokenness, saying whatever came into the mind, whether offensive or not, in contrast to dissimulation, cant, pretense, flattery, adulation, assentation, and

¹ *Epicurus*, ed. by Cyril Bailey (Oxford, 1926).

² *Brutus* 85, 292.

³ *De fin.* i. 5. 16.

⁴ *περί παρρησίας*, text by A. Olivieri (Teubner, 1914).

the like. It was not, however, opposed to boasting or exaggeration (*ἀλαζονεία*), on the one hand, and self-depreciation (*εἰρωνεία*), on the other, the mean between which Aristotle distinctly says is nameless, though in another place he calls it *ἀληθεία*.⁵ In rhetoric the use of outspokenness for the sake of surprise was falsely classified as a figure of speech, rendered in Latin by *libertas*, *licentia*, or *oratio libera*.⁶

Closer definition came inevitably with the emergence of the term as a classical topic. The more precise meaning is readily gleaned from the remains of the Herculean roll which contained the epitome of Zeno's essays done by Philodemus, and this in spite of the fact that five-sixths of the whole is lost and the middle third of each surviving column is crumbled away. Freedom of speech, as a paideutic method, is there assumed to be divided into two parts: first, reproof (*ἐπιτίμησις*), or, if more severe, rebuke (*ἐπίπληξις*) for faults exhibited or for mistakes committed; and second, admonition (*νουθέτησις*) for future behavior.⁷ Boisterous or violent condemnation, after the manner of the cynics, is severely condemned.⁸ All reproof and admonition must be done with gentleness, kindliness, and courtesy.⁹ This injunction seems to have given a new vogue to Roman *suavitas*, for which Atticus, among others, was noted, in contrast to the old-fashioned *asperitas*. This kindly tone, it may be observed, was with increasing consistency maintained by Horace as opposed to Lucilius. Epicureanism was making a distinct contribution to the European concept of a cultured gentleman.

To round off this definition, however, it is necessary to speak of candor. Cicero rendered this idea by *veritas*, which is Aristotle's *ἀληθεία*; but during the Augustan age the adjective *candidus*, if not the noun *candor*, took on the meaning frank, unaffected—and this probably under Epicurean teaching. The new virtue, for it was new in so far as it was specifically cultivated, signified absolute frankness and openness of speech and conduct, without, however, implying the reproof and admonition that went with *παρηγορία*. For example, Horace displays both candor and freedom of speech toward Maecenas, and

⁵ *Eth. Nic.* 1108 a 21 and 1127 a 13.

⁶ *Ad Herennium* iv. 36. 48; Quintilian *Inst.* ix. 2. 27.

⁷ Olivieri's Index may be consulted.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, frags. 37, 38, 52 *et alibi*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Preface, p. vii.

does not refrain from chiding him sharply, especially in *Epistles* i. 7, where he sets forth his views on the proper relationship between client and patron. On the other hand, Horace never ventures to chide Augustus, although he displays a candor that is amazing. He assigns him second place to his best friend Maecenas in the first book of the *Odes*; he welcomes home the stubborn republican friend Pompeius, who had continued to fight against the triumvirate after Philippi;¹⁰ he lays bare his feelings on the occasion of the offer of a secretaryship in the imperial court;¹¹ and he does not withdraw the ode to Licinius Murena after his execution as a conspirator, although Vergil, after a similar disaster, saw fit to strike out the passage about Cornelius Gallus from the fourth georgic.

Touching this question, it would seem that the best usage sanctions *veritas* as a noun and *candidus* as an adjective. The latter, it may be observed, is a term from our lady's dressing table, signifying a complexion untouched by rouge, as in Catullus 86:

Quintia formosa multis: mihi candida, longa, recta est.

Cicero, discussing the virtue of candor in the *De amicitia*, xxv. 95, defines the opposite, *omnia fucata et simulata*. The metaphorical meaning in the new sense is exemplified by *Satires* i. 5. 41-42:

animae qualis neque candidiores
terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter.

The use of *candidiores* here is more than casual; Tucca and Varius were members of the small Epicurean group to which Vergil, at one time at least, belonged.¹² They were pledged to frankness and friendship. Quintilius Varus was also outstanding for candor in this group, *Odes* i. 24. 7:

incorrupta fides, nudaque veritas,

where *veritas*, as a noun, carries the same meaning as the adjective *candidiores*. Another example is *Epistles* i. 4. 1: *Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex*. From the time of Horace onward, the word continued to be used in this sense, one of many minor legacies of Epicurean teaching.

¹⁰ *Odes* ii. 7.

¹¹ *Ibid.* iii. 16.

¹² Probus *Vita* (Diehl, p. 43).

Varus is put forward in *Ars poetica* 434-38 as displaying, not only candor, but also *παρρησία* in the new specialized sense:

Quintilio si quid recitares, "Corrige, sodes,
hoc" aiebat "et hoc." Etc.

This passage exhibits both *ἐπιτιμήσις* and *νουθέτησις*. Quite on a parallel with this is the alleged criticism of Vergil by Varius in *Catalepton* vii. Frank mutual correction of faults, an Epicurean rule, was also a law of the Augustan poets.

One of the two best specimens of parresiastic odes is addressed to Licinius Murena (ii. 10). The Kiessling-Heinze edition rejects the identification of this man with the brother-in-law of Maecenas on three grounds: first, because a much higher honor seems to be accorded Sestius, the colleague of Licinius, by the dedication of i. 4, close to Maecenas and Augustus; second, Horace would not have ventured to preach the golden mean to Licinius while consul; and third, the *Fasti* give his name as A. Terentius Varro Murena (really only the *Varro* is preserved).

The third reason is invalid because of the known retention of original, along with adoptive, names in the late Republic. For example, although Cicero, writing to Atticus on the occasion of his uncle's death, addresses him as "Q. Caecilius Pomponianus Atticus," many years later Cornelius Nepos styles him "T. Pomponius Atticus," although he, too, records his adoption.¹³ The second reason is invalid because the editors falsely assume that the poet is writing as a humble client to an aristocratic patron, and not as a frank friend to his own equal. We learn from Cassius Dio that Licinius was "accustomed to use violent and intemperate freedom of speech toward all and sundry."¹⁴ Furthermore, it seems to have been his elevation to the consulship that tempted him to the fatal decision, because we know from the *Fasti* that his death occurred during his tenure of office. During this time, therefore, if ever, when insolence was growing, friendly reproof and admonition were timely. The first reason, the alleged tactlessness in honoring Sestius above Licinius, is completely offset by the fact that Horace steadily honors Maecenas above

¹³ *Ad Att.* iii. 20; Nepos *Vita* i and v; also Egbert, *Latin Inscriptions*, pp. 94-95.

¹⁴ *liv.* 3: ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατακορεῖ τῇ παρρησίᾳ πρὸς πάντας ὁμοίως ἐχρήτο.

Augustus, even to the extent of drawing reproach from the princeps.¹⁵ Lastly, as will appear presently, the Licinius ode properly belongs where it stands, in a group of parresiasitic odes; the ode to Sestius is merely protreptic.

Perhaps a key to the Licinius ode may be found in line 8 in the word *sobrius*. This takes on significance when we recall that Epicurus advocated a sober reasonableness (*νήφων λογισμός*) as the best prophylactic against turmoil in the soul.¹⁶ It was this quality that Licinius, with his habit of "using violent and intemperate freedom of speech toward all and sundry," certainly lacked; and it was quite logical on the part of Horace, as a candid friend, to chide him for his excesses and recommend the golden mean. This was *παρρησία* in the specialized Epicurean sense as we find it set forth by Philodemus. That he did not later withdraw the ode is consistent, not only with his candid independence of spirit, but also with another Epicurean principle, reverence for the memory of departed friends.¹⁷

Quite comparable with the parresiasitic ode to Licinius is another from the same group (ii. 3), addressed to Dellius. The offense of this man was similar, the license of an unbridled tongue; and he receives similar advice: *Aequam memento rebus in arduis*, etc. We learn from Plutarch that he was insolent to Cleopatra and was compelled to flee for his life.¹⁸ The elder Seneca records one of his sarcasms at the expense of Antony.¹⁹ Valerius Messalla called him the *desultor omnium bellorum*, and from the admonition administered in this ode we may infer that he was subject also to alternating fits of exultation and depression. Once an ode is recognized as parresiasitic, it may be noted, it is justifiable to deduce the man's character from the admonition rendered.

Following the ode to Licinius is one addressed to Quinctius Hirpinus (ii. 11), with which goes *Epistles* i. 16. In the ode he is reproved for borrowing trouble, but the epistle is more distinctly parresiasitic. It is built around a well-known principle, equally Horatian and Epicurean, line 65, *nam qui cupiet, metuet quoque*. The particular folly of

¹⁵ Sueton. *Vita* (Roth, p. 298).

¹⁶ *Epistle to Menoeceus* 132.

¹⁷ No. 50 (Bailey, p. 133): Ἡδὺ ἢ φίλου μνήμη τεθνηκότος.

¹⁸ *Antony* 59.

¹⁹ *Suasoria* i. 7.

Hirpinus is that known to Zeno and Philodemus as φιλοδοξία, an unhealthy desire for the good opinion of others, or, conversely, the fear of ἄδοξία.²⁰ This topic is so frequent in Horace that we can hardly refuse to connect it with the περὶ παρρησίας of Philodemus. It may be added that the epistle ends with an aphorism, an expedient commended by Philodemus as tending to make admonition more palatable and more likely to gain serious attention.²¹

In this same group Pollio, while honored with the first place in the book, does not escape a warning that danger lurks in the description of civil wars; and he is admonished to return to the drama. The second, addressed to Sallust, is not free from reproof and admonition. Valgius in No. 9 is rebuked for unbecoming grief. These, along with the Dellius and Licinius odes, constitute a distinctly parresiastic group. Even No. 4, addressed to the mythical Xanthias, exhibits reproof combined with admonition.

In the same class belong *Odes* i. 29 and *Epistles* i. 12, addressed to Iccius. The first exhibits gentle but unmistakable reproof for the dispersion of his philosophical texts preparatory to joining in the mad Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus. The epistle, on the other hand, is pure admonition; he is reminded that it is not the possession of wealth but the use of it that makes a man happy. A noticeable feature of it is a gentle irony, which, though condemned by Epicurus, was recommended by Zeno and Philodemus as "stinging every man lightly and yet giving pleasure."²²

Mention is made by Philodemus of the practice of administering admonition through third parties.²³ A specimen of this is afforded by lines 15-19 of the epistle to Julius Florus (i. 3). Horace inquires what Celsus is doing, *monitus multumque monendus* "to avoid imitation and to seek for originality of treatment." This is both ἐπιτίμησις and νουθέτησις. Florus himself does not escape reproof and is admonished to seek wisdom rather than the world's "cold poultices of care," and to be genuinely reconciled with his friend Munatius.

It need hardly be interjected that when odes or epistles lack reproof and contain general admonition only, they are no longer parresiastic

²⁰ *Op. cit.* xxii a 10; xxiii b 7; frag. 3. l. 7; xxii a 3-4.

²¹ *Ibid.* vi a 8-15.

²² *Op. cit.*, frag. 26, ll. 4-10.

²³ *Ibid.*, 17, ll. 3-4.

but protreptic, like the epistle of Epicurus to Menoeceus, which is thought to be an echo of the lost *Protrepticus* of Aristotle.²⁴ This protreptic element is, of course, almost ubiquitous in the writings of Horace, and reminds us of the injunction found in the *Vatican Collection*, No. 41, "Never cease to proclaim the principles of the true philosophy." Horace did for Epicurean ethics, without advertising the fact, what Lucretius did for Epicurean physics with insistent proclamation. The truth of this has been less apparent because not a single Horatian commentator knows his Epicureanism thoroughly. The present revival of Epicurean studies in Italy and Germany will possibly result in a better understanding of the poet.

It is worth while to observe the distribution of the parresiasitic poems in the works of Horace. On the one hand they are massed together in the first part of the second book of the *Odes*; and on the other, dispersed here and there in the first book of the *Epistles*, Nos. 3, 7, 8, 12, and 16. This seems too regular to be merely casual. In *Odes* i we find only No. 29. In *Odes* iv there is only the rather sharp reprehension of Vergil, No. 12, of which more is said below. It seems likely, therefore, that the theme of Philodemus' essay interested Horace for several years in his later middle age, first, when health and prosperity seemed to justify his chiding of his own contemporaries, and second, when age and eminence placed him in a position to warn and admonish members of the younger set, such as Celsus. To assume that he knew the essay of Philodemus is reasonable in itself and not unsupported by the internal evidence. All will recall that he names Philodemus in *Satires* i. 2. 121, a very early composition.

A quite exceptional place in the fourth book is occupied by the sharply parresiasitic ode addressed to Vergil, No. 12. This anomaly is rendered the more remarkable by the equally anomalous position of No. 3 in the first book, the propempticon addressed to the same on his departure for Greece. It is always pointed out that, while the first three books of the *Odes* were published as a collection in 23 B.C., the only recorded voyage of Vergil to Greece took place in 19 B.C. This double anomaly tempts us to the suggestion that neither ode now occupies its original place. The propempticon, written four years after 23, should originally have stood in the fourth book. On the other hand,

²⁴ Ettore Bignone, *Atene e Roma*, Ser. III, XI (1933), 13-58, *passim*.

the demand upon Vergil for a box of nard and the implied reproof for unseasonable thrift would naturally have been made at an earlier date, when the fortunes of both were running high, between 23 and 19 B.C., and while friendly raillery would have been most excusable. Again, by virtue of its content, the ode would naturally have been placed in the first half of the second book in the parresiastic group.

It is conceivable, therefore, that Horace, when issuing a final edition, after the swift increase of Vergil's fame following his untimely death and the publication of the *Aeneid*, thought fit to insert the exquisite propempticon in the first book in a place of high honor after the odes to Maecenas and Augustus, and at the same time to demote the parresiastic ode from its original setting to its present less conspicuous place in the fourth book. This seems to be a simple and reasonable explanation of a double anomaly.

VICTORIA COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Ἐμπορος, Ναύκληρος, AND Κάπηλος: A PROLEGOMENA
TO THE STUDY OF ATHENIAN TRADE¹

BY MOSES I. FINKELSTEIN

IT IS unfortunate for the study of Greek economic history that so many scholars have been unable to break away from modern channels of thought and, specifically, from modern terminology. Expressions such as "firms," "joint stock companies," "bank drafts," "capitalists," and the like constantly appear in their discussions of Greek business activity. The confusion of thought which must inevitably arise from such terminology interferes with any attempt to obtain a correct view of the conditions existing in antiquity. Such terms, closely bound up with definite modern connotations, cannot fail to bring a great variety of elements into the picture which never existed in ancient Greece. Yet the difficulty is easily surmounted. One may retain the Greek terms either in the original or in transliteration, accompanied by the necessary explanations, or one may employ modern terminology after it has been properly defined in its application to antiquity.² The common failure to use the Greek terms in the sense in which the Greeks employed them is nowhere more apparent than in the treatment of the words which distinguished the various types of Greek traders.³

¹ The author wishes to thank Professor W. L. Westermann of Columbia University for many helpful suggestions.

² W. L. Westermann has hit upon a variation of the first method, or, perhaps more correctly, a combination of the two types, in his use of the expression "trapezite banking" in his article, "Warehousing and Trapezite Banking in Antiquity," in *Journal of Economic and Business History*, III (1930), 30-54. The second method becomes necessary with terms like "capital," and it is in just that case that perhaps the worst confusion has arisen. Max Weber pointed out in his article, "Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum," in the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, I (3d ed., 1909), 52-188, that much of the controversy about the extent of capitalism in antiquity can be attributed to the failure of the various participants to define their uses of the term "capital." See also Friedrich Oertel's remarks in his notes to the third edition of Robert von Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt* (München, 1925), II, 515-16.

³ Not only has the inability to steer clear of modern concepts caused considerable confusion in terminology, but it has also produced many valueless conclusions, as, e.g., the oft-repeated remark that wages in Greece were low. The implication in this state-

In the main the Greeks used three words to designate men engaged in commercial activity: ἔμπορος, ναύκληρος, and κάπηλος.⁴ Much has been written in modern times in an attempt to classify these three types of merchants. Yet no one, to my knowledge, has taken the logically prior step of determining whether ancient usage was sufficiently constant to warrant the definition of these terms into exact and consistent meanings. In other words, all the scholars who have dealt with this question have started from the premise that Greek traders were classifiable according to some standard (usually a modern one) and, further, that the ancients themselves followed this classification. Having established their categories, they have then proceeded under the assumption that the status of every trader mentioned by Demosthenes, for example, may be accurately determined from the word used in referring to him. Further, upon these systems has been built many a theory about Greek trade, about its "capitalistic" or "non-capitalistic" nature, or about producer-consumer relations.⁵

Although each of these three words, ἔμπορος, ναύκληρος, and κάπηλος, probably had a specific denotation, customary ancient usage disregarded the distinctions so frequently that we may not safely make any deductions from the terminology per se.⁶ In the light of the

ment is, of course, that they were low as compared with modern standards. When we ask what standards, confusion arises. That three obols, e.g., is a smaller sum of money by weight and metallic content than twenty dollars is unquestionable—and meaningless. Yet meaningless as it may be, it is the only basis for the comparison, since three obols in fifth-century Greece was a living wage, though minimum, and hence quite comparable to twenty dollars today. The figures which I have used here are, of course, arbitrary.

⁴ These terms are to be discussed in their commercial sense only, and not in such uses as ἔμπορος for "voyager" (e.g., Aesch. *Choeph.* 661–62), etc. Other words for traders than these three are also found, but their use is comparatively so rare that I shall mention them only incidentally. No attempt will be made to discuss specific terms such as ἀροτοπώλης, ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος, and the like.

⁵ See, e.g., Johannes Hasebroek, *Staat und Handel im alten Griechenland* (Tübingen, 1928), pp. 1–8.

⁶ Numerous examples of the uncertainty of Greek economic terminology in general might be cited, e.g., the use of χρῆματα to mean money or goods or both (see Fritz Pringsheim, *Der Kauf mit fremdem Geld* ["Romanistische Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte"] (Leipzig, 1916), No. 1, pp. 5–6), or the innumerable meanings of οὐσία. We may compare modern words like "dealer," "trader," "shopkeeper," etc., and the varying connotations of each. Paul Huvelin, "Mercatura," in Daremb.-Sag., III², 1731–32, points out that even modern legislation is "hardly able to mark the line which separates

emphasis placed upon these terms in so important a work as that of Johannes Hasebroek,⁷ the subject is worthy of a detailed examination.

The present discussion will be limited to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Even that period is perhaps too long, for the connotations of words such as these frequently change within a few years. Unfortunately, there is not enough material available to allow a closer delimitation of the period to be discussed.⁸ It has seemed advisable to eliminate all authors whose writings fall entirely after the death of Alexander, but to include all the works of those authors who overlap Alexander's reign. The only later works which have been used are the lexica and scholia; and their importance for this question has been greatly overrated. As is to be expected, they are as badly confused in their definitions and classifications as are most modern students who have dealt with this subject.⁹

Only a mere handful of the numerous passages in which these three terms appear are in themselves of definitive value. Plato, after differentiating between sale of one's own products (*αὐτοπωλική*) and sale of the products of others (*μεταβλητική*), goes on to distinguish in the latter group between *καπηλική*, trade which is carried on within the city, and *ἐμπορική*, the exchange of commodities from city to city.¹⁰ Aristotle calls *ἐμπορία* the principal means of obtaining profit through exchange (*μεταβλητική*) and subdivides it into *ναυκληρία*, *φορτηγία*, and *παράστασις*.¹¹ Elsewhere he states that "marketing" (*ἀγοραῖος*)

the merchant from the non-merchant." See U. E. Paoli, *Studi di diritto attico* (Firenze, 1930), pp. 99-101, for a discussion of this same problem in connection with the *δίκαι ἐμπορικά*. Cf. Oertel's review of H. Knorrings, *Emporos* (Amsterdam, 1926), in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 37-38.

⁷ Cited in n. 5.

⁸ The great majority of sources date from the fourth century, and the conclusions reached may be taken as primarily applicable to that century. Nearly all the sources are Athenian.

⁹ Failure to pay proper attention to the chronology has produced some amazing results. A particularly glaring example is to be found in K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Privatalterthümer* (3d ed. by Hugo Blümner; Freiburg i.B., 1882), p. 428, n. 3, where the statement is made that *ἐμποροι* always used boats belonging to others. The authorities cited are Homer *Od.* xxiv. 300 and Hesych., s.v. *ἐμπορος*!

¹⁰ *Soph.* 223C-D. Cf. *Repub.* 371D, where Plato defines *κάπηλος* as a trader who buys and sells in the *ἀγορά*, and *ἐμπορος* as one who trades from city to city.

¹¹ *Pol.* 1258b. This passage has proved a stumbling-block for every commentator. The meaning of *παράστασις* is particularly obscure, and an almost unbelievable variety of suggestions has been put forth. It seems to me to be a fruitless task to attempt to

consists of buying (ὠνή), selling (πρᾶσις), ἐμπορία, and καπηλεία.¹² That is all that the Greeks have left us by way of definition, and the confusion is immediately apparent. Aristotle in one passage takes ἐμπορία to be the generic term for "trade," including ναύκληρία among its subdivisions, and then, in the same work, proceeds to use the term merely as a form of ἀγοραίος, apparently distinct not only from καπηλεία, but also from buying and selling.¹³ Plato, on the surface more consistent, differentiates the two terms on the basis of the scene of operations: καπηλεία is local, ἐμπορία interlocal commerce; and, according to his view, both concepts would seem to exclude trade in commodities of one's own production.

Two or three other passages, while not definitions, may be included among the definitive sources. The commercial laws, cited by Demosthenes,¹⁴ make certain provisions for ναύκληροι and ἔμποροι in connection with their activity, namely, ἐμπορία. This would seem to lead to three inferences: (1) that ναύκληροι and ἔμποροι are to be distinguished from each other, although none of these laws now extant does so in any way, (2) that Plato is correct in defining ἔμπορος as a "foreign trader,"¹⁵ and (3) that ἐμπορία is the generic term for "commerce." But Isocrates uses ἐμπορία to denote trade in general, and in the same passage uses καπηλεύειν in the identical sense.¹⁶ A similar

unravel the mystery, and since my whole discussion hinges on mass evidence and not on the interpretation of any one passage, I make no attempt at it. Suggestions about παράστασις have been offered, among others, by B. Büchschütz, *Besitz und Erwerb im griechischen Alterthum* (Halle, 1869), p. 456; Hermann-Blümner, *op. cit.*, p. 428; Victor Brants, "Les sociétés commerciales à Athènes," *Rev. de l'instruc. publique en Belgique*, XXV (1882), 114-17; Henri Francotte, *L'industrie dans la Grèce ancienne* ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," fasc. 7-8 [1900-1901]), I, 301-2 (contra Lujo Brentano, *Das Wirtschaftsleben der antiken Welt* [Jena, 1929], p. 43, n. 1); L. Beauchet, *Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne* (Paris, 1897), IV, 380-81; Huvelin, "Mercatura" and "Navicularius," in Daremb.-Sag., III², 1756, and IV¹, 20, respectively; Gustave Glotz, *Le travail dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1920), p. 351; Knorrunga, *op. cit.*, p. 115; Ettore Ciccotti, *Commercio e civiltà nel mondo antico* (Milano, 1929), p. 68, n. 1. Note also the various attempts at interpretation made by translators. A particularly good example of "wish-fulfilment translation" is B. Saint-Hilaire's "commerce par eau, commerce par terre, et vente en boutique" (2d ed.; Paris, 1848), pp. 38-39.

¹² *Pol.* 1291a.

¹³ Cf. Plato's καὶ πωλοῦντες καὶ καπηλεύοντες in *Protag.* 313D. Aristot. *Eth. Eud.* 1215a adds to the confusion still further.

¹⁴ Dem. xxxiii. 1 and variously in oration lviii. Cf. also l. 6.

¹⁵ This follows from the nature of the commercial laws.

¹⁶ ii. 1.

confusion (or carelessness) is found in Plato's *Republic*, where Plato employs the term *καπηλεύειν* in referring to both *κάπηλοι* and *ἐμποροί*.¹⁷

The few passages cited above are enough to indicate the chaos which will be found when all the relevant ancient sources are brought together. The great majority of modern writers merely state in passing (with minor variations) that the *ναύκληρος* was the shipowner, that the *ἐμπορος* was the international wholesaler, always a sea-trader, and generally not using his own ship, and that the *κάπηλος* was the retailer and middleman in the market place.¹⁸

A few men have, however, delved deeper into the problem and their conclusions must be summarized at greater length. To examine all the various views in detail is obviously impossible. The fullest discussion is that of Hasebroek.¹⁹ He considers all three as middlemen between producer and consumer, and defines them as follows:

¹⁷ 525C-D.

¹⁸ Thus August Böckh, *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener* (3d ed. by Max Fränkel; Berlin, 1886), I, 61-62, 77, 124, 636, n. c; Hermann-Blümner, *op. cit.*, pp. 419-20, 426-28; Beauchet, *op. cit.*, IV, 86-88; T. Thalheim, "Ἐμπορία," in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. V, col. 2526; A. Hug and Erich Ziebarth, "Καπηλείον" and "Κάπηλοι," *ibid.*, Vol. X, cols. 1888-89; Henri Francotte, "Industrie und Handel," *ibid.*, Vol. IX, col. 1403; Louis Gernet, *L'approvisionnement d'Athènes en blé au V^e et au IV^e siècle* ("Université de Paris, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres," XXV [1909]), pp. 327, 344; Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 343-44; Ciccotti, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69; and others.

The most detailed expression of the traditional view will be found in Paul Huvelin's four articles, "Mercator," "Mercatura," "Navicularius," and "Negotiator," in *Daremb.-Sag.*, III², 1731-36 and 1743-69; IV¹, 20-21 and 41-45, respectively. He takes as his starting-point the hypothesis that a merchant "neither buys nor sells for himself," i.e., he must be a middleman, and, further, that the Greek writers recognized this distinction ("Mercatura," p. 1732). His classification is, in brief: (1) *μεταβλητική* (true commerce), subdivided into *ἐμπορία* ("grand commerce") and *καπηλεία* (trade properly); (2) the *ἐμπορος* essentially a sea-trader; (3) *κάπηλος*, originally meaning the land-trader, and, since land trade was never important in Greece, used to designate the small merchant and shopkeeper; (4) *ναύκληρος*, with three meanings: (a) the owner of a ship who rents it to an *armateur* (entrepreneur), (b) the entrepreneur of a ship, who may or may not own it, and (c) a ship-captain; and (5) *ἐμπορος* and *ναύκληρος*, generally used together. Another detailed discussion will be found in Büchsenhüt, *op. cit.*, pp. 443-58; this frequently cited work is entirely antiquarian in its approach, and the use of the source materials violates all rules of historical research.

Similar definitions are given in all the dictionaries from Stephanus to the new Liddell and Scott.

¹⁹ In the work cited in n. 5, and in an earlier article, "Die Betriebsformen des griechischen Handels im IV. Jahrh.," in *Hermes*, LVIII (1923), 393-425. This view has been accepted in *toto* by August Kraemer in his review in *Philologische Wochen-schrift*, Vol. XLIX (1929), cols. 378-90, 403-13. My citations to Hasebroek's work are all to his book and not to the article in *Hermes*.

Kapelos is the trader who normally does not leave his domicile in order to carry out his trading activity, . . . in other words, the local dealer who sells in the home market. . . . Opposed . . . are naukleros and emporos. They are the traders of the interlocal and international commerce from place to place, especially using the sea. . . . Naukleros is the trader who owns his own ship and carries out his trading activity on this ship, usually in person; emporos (originally simply passenger) is the trader without his own ship. . . . Since the trader without his own ship is the characteristic phenomenon of Greek commercial life, so "emporos" exceeds this special meaning and has the general sense of "Fernhändler," as opposed to the kapelos . . . just as the corresponding "emporion" is opposed to "kapelia."

Had he stopped there, Hasebroek would merely have repeated the traditional viewpoint. He was, however, far too familiar with the source materials to accept this simple, three-ply differentiation as a complete and final one. His other remarks may be outlined as follows: (1) a further differentiation respecting the κάπηλος must be made "according to the method of purchasing the goods which he sells: if the goods come directly from the producer, he is a kapelos in the narrower, true sense; if they come from another trader . . . then he is a 're-sale-kapelos' (παλιγκάπηλος)";²⁰ (2) if he is selling his own products, he is to be further distinguished as an αὐτοπώλης;²¹ (3) the κάπηλος is not a shopkeeper as such—for this concept the Greeks more often used μεταβολεύς,²² though the κάπηλος was also frequently a shopkeeper or peddler; (4) the essential distinction between ἔμποροι and κάπηλοι, then, is that of local as opposed to foreign trade, and not that of retailer versus trader *en gros*;²³ (5) the κάπηλος frequently sold to another trader and it is possible that "he generally did not come into contact with the consumers, but re-sold to the local retailers"; (6) "naukleroi and emporoi, however, are also not wholesalers per se," though they obviously preferred to dispose of their goods in bulk.²⁴

²⁰ He cites Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156; Dem. xxv. 45, lvi. 7; Pollux vii. 12; and Phot., s.v. παλιγκάπηλος.

²¹ He cites Plato *Soph.* 223C, 231D; *Politikos* 260C.

²² His authorities are Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156; Dem. xxv. 46; and Pollux i. 50.

²³ So also H. Bolkestein, *Het economisch leven in Griekenlands bloeitijd* (Haarlem, 1923), pp. 164–70; and F. Oertel in his review of Knorringa in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 38.

²⁴ Early in his discussion Hasebroek says that "the meaning of concepts of this nature is at all times more or less varying." Despite this observation, and despite the exceptions which he constantly notes, he proceeds to make a sharp differentiation between the several terms.

H. Knorringa also devotes considerable space to this problem,²⁵ but the unfortunate method which he employed in the organization of his materials²⁶ makes it difficult to determine his position exactly. His views may be summarized somewhat as follows: (1) that, when using either *ἐμπορος* or *κάπηλος*, "people especially thought of dealers in victuals, meat and drink,"²⁷ the *ἐμπορος* primarily handling grain, the *κάπηλος* trading chiefly in wine; (2) that the *ἐμπορος* usually traded by sea, but that this was not essential;²⁸ (3) that, contrary to Hasebroek's view, "it appears that also a trader with a ship of his own was usually called *ἐμπορος*, and that, if such a trader was called *ναύκληρος*, he was more looked upon as the owner of a ship than as a trader";²⁹ and (4) that Hasebroek overemphasized the trading activities of the *ναύκληρος*, as against his primary occupation of shipowner.³⁰

Of all the views put forth, the most nearly tenable, in my judgment, is that of Paoli,³¹ who, after pointing out the usual distinctions, goes on to show that the standard modern translations (e.g., *ναύκληρος* = *Reeder*, *armateur*, *armatore*) are a monstrous combination of ancient and modern concepts.³² Rather than perpetuate such confusion, Paoli advocates the retention of the original Greek. Furthermore, he makes no attempt to evolve a scheme which will encompass all the various definitions and usages of antiquity, but merely cites these definitions and usages and their sources.

²⁵ In the work cited in n. 6, esp. pp. 46-47, 51-52, 96-98, and 113-18.

²⁶ His arrangement is by ancient authors. See Oertel's very pertinent criticism in his review in *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 35-39.

²⁷ He cites numerous passages in Plato and Aristophanes.

²⁸ His authority is Aristoph. *Ach.* 974.

²⁹ His authorities are Diels, 636; Aristoph. *Birds* 711; Thuc. i. 137. 2; Xen. *Oec.* viii. 12, *Anab.* vii. 5. 14, *Hell.* iii. 4. 1; and Plato *Epist.* 329E.

³⁰ Erich Ziebarth, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels im alten Griechenland* (Hamburg, 1927), pp. 45-46, agrees. He points especially to *IG*, I², 127 and 128, and Lycurg. *c. Leoc.* 18.

³¹ Especially in his article, "Grossi e piccoli commercianti nelle liriche di Orazio," *Riv. di fil. e di istruz. class.*, II (new ser., 1924), 45-63. See also his *Studi di diritto attico* (Firenze, 1930), pp. 23-24. In his brief article, "Armature (nel diritto greco)," *Enciclop. ital.*, IV, 409, he seems to revert to the more current view of the matter; and more recently in his article, "L'autonomia del diritto commerciale nella Grecia classica," *Riv. del dir. comm. e del dir. gen. d. obbligazioni*, XXXIII (1935), 36-54.

³² The English term "shipowner" does not necessarily imply the same large scale of operations as do the German, French, and Italian words given, and may, therefore, be used as a translation of *ναύκληρος*.

Before attempting a critical examination of these theories, we should note that the ancient sources are so chaotic that it is almost impossible to present them in any systematic arrangement. It seems best to me to treat the passages in four main groups, subdivided according to the type of information they provide for our problem. For the moment, the scholia and lexicæ will not be considered at all.³³

The first group is concerned with the general term for "trade." On the one hand, we have those passages which indicate that the term is ἔμπορία.³⁴ On the other hand, there are a few cases where καπηλεία is clearly used as the generic word.³⁵ We may note especially the contradictions which are found within the works of the same author as follows: Plato in the *Republic* (260C-D and 525C) as against several other passages cited in note 34; page 1345a of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica* as against pages 1345b and 1346a; the interchangeable use of the two terms by Isocrates in the letter to Nicocles (§ 1); Aristotle in *Politics* 1256a-1258a as against 1258b.

The second group includes those passages which relate to the mari-

³³ Although I have attempted to examine every use of the words ναύκληρος, ἔμπορος, and κάπηλος in the literature and inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries, I do not cite passages such as *IG*, II², 1553-78, which throw no light (however dubious) on our problem.

³⁴ In Dem. xxxiii. 1, 23 and lviii. 10, 53, laws are quoted which relate to the ναύκληροι and ἔμποροι, and in each case ἔμπορος is singled out as the generic term. In lvi. 10 he refers to a law about ναύκληροι and ἐπιβάται, apparently used for ἔμποροι (most unusual, but cf. lvi. 24). Cf. Herod. iii. 139; Thuc. vi. 31. 5; and Aristot. *Pol.* 1258b. Plato, in several passages in which he is enumerating various occupations, uses ἔμπορία and ἐμπορικὴ for trade (*Soph.* 265A, *Phileb.* 56E, *Euthyph.* 14E-15A, *Politikos* 267E); likewise Aristoph. *Peace* 296-98; Dem. xxxiii. 146; and Aristot. *Oec.* 1345b-1346a, Isoc. ii. 1 and vii. 25 may also be mentioned here, for the interchangeable use of ἔμπορία and καπηλεία clearly indicates that he is referring to trade generally and not to one specific form. Of dubious value, but perhaps to be included in this group are Simonides, frag. 127 (Bergk); Aristoph. *Birds* 718; and Xen. *Mem.* iii. 4. 2 and *Hiero* ix. 9.

The only place where I find ναυκληρία used in what seems to be the generic sense is in Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 8, where Xenophon appears to be enumerating occupations: γεωργίαν ἢ ναυκληρίαν ἢ ἄλλ'. The exact meaning of ναυκληρία here is, however, not at all certain. Xenophon may have meant shipowning and not commerce.

³⁵ Above all, Isoc. ii. 1, already discussed in n. 34. Aristot. *Oec.* 1345a lists καπηλεία in a catalogue of occupations alongside of γεωργικὴ (cf. *Pol.* 1320a), whereas Dem. xxxiii. 146 and Xen. *Mem.* iii. 7. 6 use ἔμπορία in the same connection. Plato (*Repub.* 525C) cautions against the acquisition of knowledge ὡς ἐμπόρους ἢ καπήλους and then later, in the same sense, says merely μὴ τοῦ καπηλεύειν. Equally important is his use of κάπηλος in *Politikos* 260C-D; there it is undoubtedly the generic term and is to be contrasted with *Soph.* 223C-D, where Plato makes a similar comment using the term ἔμπορος. The use of καπηλεία and καπηλική in Aristot. *Pol.* 1256a-1258a also seems clearly generic. See finally Herod. i. 94, ii. 35, 141, and iii. 89.

time aspect of trade. It is usually stated that the *ἐμποροὶ* engaged in interlocal trade by sea,³⁶ but there are a few cases where *ἐμπορία* is used to refer definitely either to land commerce or to purely sedentary trading.³⁷ Of particular importance here are those passages which mention the traders who follow the armies both to provide supplies for the soldiers and to buy up their booty. This type of dealer can hardly be classed with the merchants carrying on large-scale operations, but rather approaches the ordinary peddler, though not entirely. At any rate, although the sea is not an important factor in his activities,³⁸ yet *ἐμπορος* appears to be the regular term for this type of dealer³⁹ (although *κάπηλος* was also used).⁴⁰ Once again it is noteworthy that Plato, who provides us with the most definite statement that *ἐμπορία* was maritime commerce, nevertheless implies clearly in one passage that it need not be so limited; and Xenophon in one case uses *ἐμποροὶ* and in another *κάπηλοι* for traders who accompanied armies.

³⁶ Of prime importance in this group are the actual definitions by Plato (*Soph.* 223D and *Repub.* 371D) of *ἐμποροὶ* as going *ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς ἄλλην πόλιν* to buy and sell. Cf. *Soph.* 224A-C and *Laues* 949E; and Lyeurg. *op. cit.* 14-15. Then we have mention of actual trips taken by *ἐμποροὶ* in *Lysias* xxxii. 25; *Isoc.* xvii. 4; *Dem.* xxxiv *passim*, xlix. 31; Lyeurg. *op. cit.* 55-57; and Ditt., *Syll.*³, No. 304. See further Simonides in *Anth. Gr.* vii. 254a; Aeschryon *ap. Walz, Rhet.*, III, 651, n. 10 (= Bergk, frag. 2); *Aristoph. Plut.* 1179-80; *Xen. Oec.* xx. 27-28, *Vect.* iii. 2-4; *Plato Critias* 117E; *Isoc.* i. 19, viii. 21, xvii. 57; *Lysias* xxii. 17; *Dem.* viii. 25; *Aristot. Ath. Pol.* 51. 4, *Pol.* 1327a; *Ephoros ap. Schol. Hes. Opera* 633 (= Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist.*, 70 F 100); *Plato ap. Plut. Themist.* xxxii. 5 (= Kock, frag. 183); and Ditt., *op. cit.*³, No. 280—all of which refer to *ἐμποροὶ* generally in connection with the sea. Finally, note the commercial laws in *Dem.* xxxiii. 1 and l. 6, and the fact that originally the judges in the *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* were called *ναυτοδίκαι*.

³⁷ In *Repub.* 371A, Plato says *ἐὰν μὲν γε κατὰ θάλατταν ἡ ἐμπορία γίγνηται*, and the inference follows logically that *ἐμπορία* need not be carried on by sea; likewise *Xen. Vect.* i. 7, *κατὰ γῆν δὲ πολλὰ δέχεται ἐμπορία*. *Thuc.* iii. 74. 2 tells of a fire in the Agora which destroyed the goods of many *ἐμποροί*. (this could hardly refer to storage); cf. the use of *ἐμπορία* in *Aeneas Tact.* x. 14. In *Xen. Hipparch.* iv. 7, the *ἐμποροὶ* mentioned are obviously engaged in interlocal trade, but by no means necessarily by sea. Cf. *Soph. Oed. Col.* 25, 303, 901, where *ἐμπορος* means traveler, and it is clear that the reference is to land travel. See also the passages cited in n. 46, where *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* are used interchangeably.

³⁸ Although in *Thuc.* vi. 31. 5 and *Xen. Hell.* i. 6. 37, *ἐμποροὶ* accompanied soldiers on foreign expeditions to Sicily and Arginusae, respectively, and of course by boat. Cf. also *Thuc.* ii. 67. 4, vii. 24. 2.

³⁹ *Thuc.* ii. 67. 4, vi. 31. 5, vii. 24. 2; and *Xen. Ages.* i. 21, *Cyr.* vi. 2. 38-39, *Hell.* i. 6. 37.

⁴⁰ *Xen. Cyr.* iv. 5. 42, contrasted with *Cyr.* vi. 2. 38-39.

Next is the group of passages regarding the distinction between ναύκληροι and ἔμποροι. The first subclass comprises those texts which indicate that the ναύκληρος was primarily a shipowner (the view of Knorrunga and Ziebarth already quoted) transporting the wares of ἔμποροι.⁴¹ The second subdivision, by no means incompatible with the first, contains cases where ναύκληροι carried on trade for themselves.⁴² In none of these cases is it stated or even implied that they transported their own merchandise exclusively. Finally, there are the rare cases where ἔμποροι undoubtedly owned their own vessels.⁴³ It is worth noting that the majority of passages in group 3 are from Demosthenes' private orations and can unhesitatingly be accepted as indicative of ordinary usage, at least during the second half of the fourth century.

The fourth group concerns the κάπηλοι. In numerous cases they are shopkeepers,⁴⁴ or at least purely local dealers.⁴⁵ But in a few passages we find κάπηλος and ἔμπορος used quite interchangeably.⁴⁶ Once

⁴¹ Most important here are the cases of ναύκληροι who are actually named and who without question transport the wares of ἔμποροι, such as Hegestratos in Dem. xxxii. 3, 4, 8, Hyblesios in Dem. xxxv. 10, 20, Dionysodoros and Parmeniskos in Dem. lvi *passim*, Lampis in Dem. xxxiv *passim*; also the anonymous ναύκληρος in Dem. xlix. 29, 40. Aeneas Tact. x. 12 apparently implies the same thing. Xenophon (*Mem.* ii. 6. 38 and iii. 9. 11) uses ναύκληρος to mean "shipowner" without reference to trade one way or another, but merely as distinguished from the pilot or captain; cf. Xen. *Vect.* iii. 14, *Anab.* vii. 2. 12; and Plato *Epist.* 346E.

⁴² Lysias vi. 49; Aristot. *Pol.* 1258b; Dem. xxxiii. 1, lvi. 3, 24; and Lycurg. *op. cit.* 18. But Arist. *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1424a, implies a distinction between ναύκληρος and ἀγοραῖος. Note the interchangeable use of ναύκληρος and ἔμπορος in Soph. *Phil.* 128, 547-49, where the character introduced as a spy passing for an ἔμπορος is referred to as being rigged out like a ναύκληρος. In Xen. *Oec.* viii. 12, it is impossible to decide whether the cargo does or does not belong to the ναύκληρος.

⁴³ Dem. viii. 25 and Isoc. xvii. 57.

⁴⁴ I cite uses of κάπηλος, καπηλείον, etc., indiscriminately: Aristoph. *Plut.* 435, 1120-21, *Eccl.* 154, *Thesm.* 347, 737, *Lys.* 466; Antiphanes *ap.* Athen. x. 441B (= Kock, frag. 24); Eubulus *ap.* Athen. xi. 473E (= Kock, frag. 80); Nicostratus *ap.* Athen. xv. 700B (= Kock, frag. 22); Lysias i. 24, frag. Teubner i. 3-5; Isoc. vii. 49, xv. 287; Theopompus *ap.* Athen. xii. 526E (= Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 115 F 62); Plato *Laws* 919A; Diogenes Cyn. *ap.* Aristot. *Rhet.* 1411a; Aeneas Tact. xxx. 1; and Ditt., *op. cit.*³, No. 169 (from Iasos).

⁴⁵ Archippos *ap.* Athen. vii. 227A (= Kock, frag. 25); Plato *Soph.* 223D, *Repub.* 371D, *Laws* 849C-D, and *Gorg.* 518B; and Theoph. *Char.* 6.

⁴⁶ Plato *Laws* 918B and Isoc. ii. 1 are clear proof. In two other passages—Plato *Soph.* 213D and *Protag.* 314A—the interchangeability of the two terms seems likely but is not entirely certain. Sophocles' use of κάπηλος to mean a Phoenician trader (*ap.* Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* ii. 125 = Nauck, frag. 823) probably belongs here too. Of uncertain value are Plato's terms ψυχεμπορικῆς and μαθηματοπωλικῆς in *Soph.* 224B, D.

On the other hand, Plato *Laws* 919D; Lysias xxii. 17-21; and Xen. *Vect.* iv. 6 clearly

more it must be pointed out that Plato here too disregards his own carefully drawn distinctions. It becomes clear that the inconsistencies are not merely variant usages by different authors, but are also to be found within the works of the same author, at times even in the same passage.⁴⁷

Now let us see what the various scholiasts and lexicographers did with this material. As indicated before, not much should be expected from them, and the very fact that the lexa and scholia devote so much attention to these terms is in itself an indication that in their time fifth- and fourth-century usage of these words required explanation. A striking example of the confusion that existed is provided by Hesychius' terse definition (among others) of *ἐμπορος* as equivalent to *μέτοικος*, which has absolutely no basis in fact. Never, to my knowledge, do we find such synonymous use in the period we are considering.⁴⁸

The most important text of this type is the scholion to Aristophanes, *Plutus* 1155, where traders (*πωλοῦντες*) are subdivided into five kinds: the *αὐτοπώλης* who sells goods of his own production, the *κάπηλος* who buys from the *αὐτοπώλης* and sells his wares in the same locality (*χώρα*) where purchased, the *ἐμπορος* who sells abroad, the

imply that there is a distinction between the two, with which cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1291a. Note the differentiation of *ἐμπορος* from *μετάβολος* implied in a fourth-century inscription from Chios (Collitz-Bechtel, IV, 875, n. 52, ll. 15-16); Thuc. vi. 31. 5, on the other hand, seems to imply synonymity of these two words.

⁴⁷ Two passages cannot be allocated to any of these groups but add to the mass of evidence, as follows: Plato *Laws* 643D-E, *καπηλείας καὶ ναυκληρίας καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων* . . . ; Aristoph. *Birds* 594-96, *τάς τ' ἐμπορίας τάς κερδαλέας πρὸς τὸν μάντιν κατερούσιν, ὥστ' ἀπολείται τῶν ναυκλήρων οὐδεὶς*.

Most of the passages referring to the *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* are omitted in this discussion, for that would necessitate a thorough analysis of these courts, which cannot be made here. The absence of that small group of passages will in no way affect our results. One example will suffice to show that the situation with regard to the various other commercial terms which I do not take up is as confused as are the three which I do discuss: contrast Dem. xxxiii. 4 with lvii. 1 for different uses of *ἐργάζομαι*.

⁴⁸ Aeschin. i. 40, *ὅσοι μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐμπόρων ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων ἢ τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων*, seems to have such implications, but it is unique in the literature of this period and is undoubtedly to be explained by the use of *ἄλλος* to mean not "other" but "in addition," as in Plato *Gorg.* 473D, *πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξένων* (cf. Aeschin. i. 163).

See also Suid., s.v. *κλαρόται*, where the equally ridiculous parallel is drawn between *μέτοικοι* and *ἐλλωτες*, *πενίσται*, etc. Note the absence of *ἐμπορος* in Pollux iii. 51-60 (*περὶ πολιτῶν, ξένων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦς*), where every conceivable synonym for foreigner and metic is given. Hesychius' definition has, strangely enough, been given considerable weight by many scholars.

παλιγκάπηλος who buys from the ἔμπορος and resells, and the μεταβολεύς, the retailer who sells in very small quantities (κατὰ τὴν κοτύλην). This passage has been used as one of the main props for most of the classifications built up by modern scholars. But can it correctly be accepted as a trustworthy scheme of definitions applying to the usage of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.? It should certainly be subjected to the same scrutiny as any of the modern definitions, and then, if accepted, it can be used only as confirmatory evidence in support of the fifth- and fourth-century sources.

When we examine these late sources using the same methods established above for the contemporary sources, the doubtful worth of such material quickly becomes apparent. It is curious that the scholiasts and lexicographers neglected the word ναύκληρος almost completely,⁴⁹ possibly because they considered its older use so similar to their own as to require no further explanation. Time and time again they define κάπηλος and ἔμπορος as ὁ πραγματευτής (a term not at all current in our period)⁵⁰ and then go on to qualify this equation with some more specific meaning.⁵¹ Can it be that they also recognized the indiscriminating uses of these terms to be found in earlier times? At any rate, we find both ἔμπορος and κάπηλος defined as the generic commercial term. Several passages connect the ἔμπορος with the sea,⁵² and a few say that the ἔμποροι used boats belonging to others.⁵³ We find many definitions of κάπηλος as the sedentary trader.⁵⁴ Thus far

⁴⁹ This is particularly noticeable in Pollux i. 50 (ἐμπόρων καὶ βαναύσων ὀνόματα), iii, 124-25 (περὶ τοῦ πωλεῖν καὶ ὠνεῖσθαι), and in his discussion of ships, i. 82-125.

⁵⁰ The only place in fifth- and fourth-century literature where I find it used in some such sense is in Dem. xlv. 4. Photius also mentions a παλινέμπορος, which I find nowhere in our sources.

⁵¹ Ἐμπορος: Hesych. and Suid. s.v.; *Etym. M.* 336. 20; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 219. 1; Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 521 (and Ravenna Schol.), 904, 1179.

Κάπηλος: Hesych. and Suid., s.v.; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 267. 24 defines κάπηλος as μεταβολεύς, πραγματευτής without further qualification. Cf. Suid., s.v. ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος, where he says παρὰ τὸ καπηλεύειν τὰ ἀνδράποδα ὅ ἐστι πιπράσκειν (similarly in Herpoer.). Note the absence of ἔμπορος in Pollux vii. 8-9, 12 (περὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πιπράσκειν ὀνομάτων).

⁵² Suid. and Hesych. s.v.; Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 521 (and Ravenna Schol.), 904, 1179.

⁵³ Hesych., Suid., and Zonaras s.v.; *Etym. M.* 336. 20; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 219. 1.

⁵⁴ Suid., s.v. πανδοκεῦτρια, ταβερνεῖα; Phot., s.v. ταβερνεῖα; Schol. Aristoph. *Flut* 426, 1155; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 379. 26.

everything works beautifully according to system, but then we come to several passages where *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* are used interchangeably. Thus, one of Suidas' definitions of *ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος* is *σωματέμπορος*,⁵⁵ and for *καπηλείας* he gives *ἐμπορείας*, as does Photius. Even more noticeable is the synonymy of *κάπηλος* with *μεταβολεύς*⁵⁶—so much so, in fact, that the scholiast to Aristophanes (*Plutus* 1155) says that in his time *κάπηλος* is regularly used to express both concepts. It is scarcely worth while discussing or even noting their definitions and uses of *παλιγκάπηλος*, *αὐτοπώλης*, and similar terms, and their statements about middlemen, etc.⁵⁷ Only a perusal of the lexica themselves, and particularly of Suidas, can adequately indicate how much confusion actually exists in them. For exact definitions they are as useless as Roget's *Thesaurus*.

We are now in a position to criticize the views of Hasebroek and Knorrunga. There are three general objections which affect the entire approach of these two scholars and which apply equally well to almost everyone else who has worked with this material. The first is the undue weight they place upon "evidence" from the scholia and lexica; some of their points are based entirely on such sources. The second is that none of their classifications has any place for large-scale trading operations by land. It is quite true that the sea played an overwhelmingly preponderant rôle in Greek economic life, and that land routes were avoided because of expense, the uncertainties of this form of travel, and the peculiar nature of the terrain with its innumerable mountains. Nevertheless, a certain amount of trade was carried on without recourse to waterways, and such traders, few as they might be, would find no place in the usual system of classification. A third

⁵⁵ Likewise in Harpocr. The scholiast to Aristoph. *Kn.* 1030 says *ἀνδραποδιστήν: σωματέμπορον . . .*, to which cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 521.

⁵⁶ Zonaras and Phot., *s.v.* *κάπηλος*; *Etym. M.* 490. 4; Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 267. 24; Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 102. 16; Schol. Aristoph. *Peace* 447 (and Ravenna Schol.); Pollux iv. 48–51. But Pollux vii. 193 says *κάπηλος δὲ οὐ μόνον οἱ μεταβολεῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ . . .* Note in connection with the preceding discussion of *κάπηλος* = *ἐμπορος* the two definitions of *ἀνδραποδοκάπηλος*: *μεταβολεὺς ἀνδραπόδων* in Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 86. 13 and in Hesych. *s.v.* Finally, note *μετάβολοι: πραγματευταί* in Hesych. *s.v.* and in Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.*, 1. 299. 3; and *παλιγκάπηλος: μεταβολεὺς* in Hesych. and Zonaras *s.v.*, and *Etym. M.* 648. 50 (all three also equate *κάπηλος* with *μεταβολεὺς*).

⁵⁷ I have not attempted to cite all the uses of these various terms to be found in the lexica and scholia but merely enough examples to indicate the situation.

objection to these systems is that none of them provides a place for such terms as ἀγοραῖος. I realize that to do so would be impossible, but rather than make such omissions I prefer not to classify at all.

Considering Hasebroek first, the following specific objections to his schema are presented:⁵⁸

1. There is not sufficient evidence to show that ἔμποροι, ναύκληροι, and κάπηλοι were all middlemen. In fact, whereas the first two from the nature of their commercial operations may be regarded as usually middlemen, the prevailing evidence would indicate that the κάπηλοι were primarily shopkeepers. Further, κάπηλος was the usual term for "shopkeeper,"⁵⁹ not μεταβολεὺς (as Hasebroek states), which occurs but rarely. We may safely say that the κάπηλοι were usually not middlemen, and we have at least one instance where the ἔμποροι were also shopkeepers in the Agora.⁶⁰ Similarly, Hasebroek's distinction between the κάπηλος who buys from the producer and the παλιγκάπηλος who buys from another trader breaks down because of the extreme rarity of the latter term.⁶¹ Nor does this rarity of παλιγκάπηλος indicate that the κάπηλοι bought their goods almost exclusively from producers. For if that were the case, what term would designate those middlemen to whom the large-scale operators disposed of their wares? Hasebroek himself carries this point to a *reductio ad absurdum* when he says of the κάπηλος that it is possible "that he generally did not come into contact with the consumers, but re-sold to the local retailers." This explanation would establish for antiquity a chain of dealers between producer and consumer which would be even more complicated and extensive than the middleman group of today.

2. Ἐμπορος may not be defined as "the trader without his own ship." Even though this was frequently the case, some ἔμποροι un-

⁵⁸ In the light of the preceding discussion, it does not seem necessary to examine the sources used by Hasebroek and Knorrinda at this point. They have all been discussed elsewhere. My criticisms are based both on their specific citations and on the material which they failed to use.

⁵⁹ See n. 44.

⁶⁰ See n. 37.

⁶¹ Note the use of παλιγκάπηλος in connection with large-scale trading in Dem. lvi. 7. I could find but three uses of this word in all the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries; the other two are Aristoph. *Plut.* 1156 and Dem. xxv. 46. None of these passages gives any clue as to the specific denotation of παλιγκάπηλος; for that modern scholars have gone to the lexica and scholia. Knorrinda (p. 118) thinks it was used "to express intense contempt," a purely fanciful interpretation which the evidence will not support.

questionably did own trading vessels, and, further, some carried on their operations by land.

3. The trading activity of the *ναύκληρος* was not his predominant one. On the other hand, I cannot subscribe to the thesis of Knorrunga and Ziebarth that he was primarily a shipowner, but prefer to consider the two aspects as approximately equal in importance.⁶²

4. It is not definitely established that all three types are always to be distinguished from the producer. As usual, we have evidence on both sides of the question.

The following objections are to be made to Knorrunga's views: (1) Granted that when the ancient authors employed the terms *ἐμπορος* and *κάπηλος* they "especially thought of dealers in victuals, meat and drink," this fact is not to be attributed to the terms themselves, but rather to the fact that food products, and particularly grain and wine, were the principal objects of ancient trade.⁶³ All the evidence clearly indicates that this commercial terminology took in every aspect of trade. (2) There is no ground for stating that "a trader with a ship of his own was usually called *ἐμπορος*." Although a few did own their ships, many (probably the majority) did not, and the *ναύκληροι* whose ships they employed as a rule transported their own commodities at the same time. (3) The *ναύκληρος* was not primarily a shipowner.

It seems to be clear that very few generalizations can be established from the available evidence as to the use of these commercial terms, and that in general we must limit ourselves to the statement that in some cases a given word was used in one way and in other cases differently. The following is a summary of my main conclusions, stated under eight main points:

1. The Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. used *ἐμπορεύομαι* and its derivatives when they wished to express the concept "trade" in its widest sense. Occasionally, but less often, the term *καπηλεύειν* was also employed.

⁶² So also Huvelin, cited in u. 18, who, however, adds a third aspect, ship-captain, which is palpably wrong.

⁶³ The same error quite frequently appears in the lexicæ and scholia. In them *κάπηλος* is often defined as "properly" a wine-seller, e.g., Suid., s.v. *καπηλῆς*, *πανδοκείτρια*; Hesych., s.v. *καπηλεύει*; Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 426, 435 (and Ravenna Schol. 435, 1063). They even suggest a false etymology to connect *κάπηλος* with wine. In this connection see also the letter of Aristippos in Hercher, *Epistolographoi Graeci*, Socraticorum 11.

2. The use of *ναύκληρος* is apparently the only consistent one of all. It seems to have been limited to the man who owned a trading vessel, who frequently (perhaps usually) engaged in commerce himself and who rarely, if ever, transported only his own merchandise. There is enough evidence to show that the few passages which might be interpreted to mean that the *ναύκληρος* was only the captain or pilot and not the owner of a ship cannot be accepted in that sense.⁶⁴ It must be emphasized that *ναύκληρος* is the only one of these words to which we may assign a definite and exclusive meaning, namely, shipowner. But even here there are variations within that meaning.

3. The *ἔμπορος* was usually a maritime trader, but not necessarily so. Conversely, the *κάπηλος* was usually a local trader. Whereas there seems to be no actual case of a *κάπηλος* making a trading voyage, the occasional synonymous use of *κάπηλος* for *ἔμπορος* seems to indicate that this was not impossible.

4. *Ἐμποροὶ* usually transported their wares on boats belonging to others. A few are known, however, who owned their own ships. Since there was the technical term *ναύκληροι* for "shipowners," who often carried on commercial operations as well, we have further proof that it is impossible even to attempt a classification. *Ἐμπορος* and *ναύκληρος* obviously are used interchangeably in many cases,⁶⁵ yet there are many other cases where one term seems to include the other, and still other cases in which they are mutually exclusive.

5. The *κάπηλος* was commonly a retailer, perhaps usually so.

6. There is unfortunately little evidence as to how *ναύκληροι* and *ἔμποροι* disposed of their wares. From the fact that they were often interlocal, maritime traders, it seems logical to infer that they were usually wholesalers. It must be kept in mind, however, that the season for sea voyages was limited and that they would therefore have sufficient time during the winter in which to dispose of their

⁶⁴ Thus note that Plato constantly uses the pilot of a ship for purposes of illustration, yet not once does he use the term *ναύκληρος* in this connection, but always *κυβερνήτης*. Cf. Plato *Laws* 707A and Xen. *Mem.* iii. 9. 11. The only exceptions are Soph. *Antig.* 994 (where *ναυκληρεῖν* is used metaphorically for "to guide or direct a city") and a similar metaphor in Aesch. *Suppl.* 176-77.

⁶⁵ It is interesting to notice that in referring to Solon's trip to Egypt, Aristotle (*Ath. Poi.* 11. 1) uses *ἐμπορία* and Plutarch (*Solon* 25) uses *ναυκληρία*.

goods at retail if they so desired. There is some evidence to show that this was occasionally done.⁶⁶

7. It seems likely that these three types were themselves, as a rule, not producers. Again we have a few definite statements to this effect,⁶⁷ but such evidence is canceled by the fact that neither the term *αὐτοπώλης* nor any other which clearly means "one who sells goods of his own production" appears except in rare instances.⁶⁸ On this point, perhaps, we are again forced to evade the issue. Some *ἐμποροί*, etc., were probably producers and others were not, and the various terms were used indiscriminately to cover both cases.

8. Hasebroek is correct in stating that the basic distinction between *ἐμποροί* and *κάπηλοι* is not that of retailer versus wholesaler but rather that of locale. How carefully the distinction was retained is another matter.

A subsequent study will deal with the same problems as they appear in the documents of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. It is very possible that the papyri, with their wealth of private and official documents, will produce more positive results than can be derived from the exclusively literary and epigraphical sources of the fifth and fourth centuries.

NEW YORK CITY

⁶⁶ Thus Thuc. iii. 74. 2; Aristoph. *Ach.* 974; and Aristot. *Oec.* 1347b. This also seems to be indicated by the use of *ἐμπορος* in a Chian inscription of the fourth century B.C. (Collitz-Bechtel, IV, 875, n. 52).

⁶⁷ E.g., Heraclid. § 60 (frag. 611 Rose) and Plato *Gorg.* 517D.

⁶⁸ Another such expression is *δημιουργός τοῦ αὐτῶν τούτων* in Plato *Gorg.* 517D. Note that Aristoph. *Peace* 1208-9 introduces the *λοφοποιός* with the words *καὶ γὰρ οὐτοσὶ δπλων κάπηλος* (cf. *ibid.* 446-47).

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE EMENDATION OF VITRUVIUS

I

The editor of *Classical Philology* has placed me under a double obligation, first, by publishing the searching criticism in October, 1934, of my edition of Vitruvius in the "Loeb Series"; second, by his courteous permission to reply in these pages.

Vitruvian studies have been strangely absent from the history of English classical scholarship. Of the thousand or so emendations recorded in my text, perhaps a third are taken, directly or indirectly, from other manuscripts than the Harleianus 2767 (H). To the remainder Jocundus contributes no fewer than 230, Sulpitius 60, Turnebus 20, Schneider 30, Rose 50, and Krohn 20. I have ventured to submit 45 emendations to the judgment of my readers. The other contributors, about 40 in number, are French, German, and Italians, with the exception of Dr. Rouse, who has helped me with some valuable improvements of the text, not to speak of the guidance he has supplied in other respects. Krohn has attributed to later German scholars emendations due to Schneider, Voss, and Turnebus. The work of tracing emendations to their authors is far from complete in my edition, although I have carried the work of Schneider, Rose, and Krohn a step farther. But, with the two exceptions stated, I regretfully fail to find a single emendation due to an Englishman. On the other hand, I have learned much from Morgan's translation of Vitruvius, and from other recent American sources. May I refer to the valuable paper on "The Provenience of the London Vitruvius" by Mr. Leslie Webber Jones, in *Speculum*, VII, 64-70? I hope to reply to this elsewhere.

Krohn's collation of H removed some of the omissions of Rose. But it is unsatisfactory in its record of orthography. And here I may explain why I was driven to reconsider the text of Vitruvius. The peculiarities of the spelling of Vitruvius go along with his accidence and syntax. In a word, it was the style of Vitruvius that attracted me at a time when I was engaged in the study of the Old Latin versions of the New Testament, and, indeed, of the Latin vernacular. In 1909 I took part in the opening meetings of the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching, founded by Dr. Rouse. Here Latin was spoken as a living tongue. And my long study of Vitruvius was lit up with a fresh light. In the workshop, colloquialisms, breaches of grammatical rules, trade words and phrases, are qualified by a certain rigidity which is compulsory when one is dealing with specifications, and other legal documents, related to building. But all these elements are fused together in the manual of Vitru-

vius. It is to be treated as a voice from the Roman workshops, as the eighth book of the *Galic War*, the *Bella Africanum* and *Hispaniense*, are the utterances of soldiers, and the Old Latin versions of the New Testament are the language of the commercial and artisan classes. And as to these, Cardinal Wiseman, in his second letter on I John, verse 7, written in 1833, demonstrated the African origin of the Old Latin versions by an elaborate analysis of the style of early African writers, and was followed by Lachmann and Tregelles. Such is the historical background of the style of Vitruvius.

He expressly requests Augustus and his other readers to pardon any explanation that too little agrees with the rules of grammar (i. 1. 18). He had already said *maxime facilius* (i. 1. 4) and was going to say *maxime tutiores* (i. 5. 5). In a word, he did not write Latin as an educated man. Nohl, the author of the *Index Vitruvianus*, traces Vitruvius' divergencies from regular grammar, in his *Analecta Vitruviana*. He is followed in the same sense by Stock and Sontheimer. Schneider proposed the alternative: "Orationis virtus . . . in Vitruvii praeceptis tam saepe desideratur ut ei videatur aut perfecta atque accurata rerum traditarum cognitio aut scribendi meditatio atque usus omnino defuisse" (I, Pref. lxix). The inaccuracies attributed to Vitruvius are rather to be found in his critics. He was right and they were wrong, for example, when he described the Olympieum at Athens as octastyle, not decastyle (iii. 2. 8); or again when he measured the date of its completion from the end of the Athenian republic, which coincided with the accession (era) of Alexander (vii, Pref. 16). In the same context the *sesemaneo* of H is obviously the *σεσημασμένα* coins bearing the stamp which guaranteed their quality (Plato *Laws* 954a). Hence my reading *σεσημασμένοις*. The commentary is throughout an attempt so to ascertain the meaning of Vitruvius as to dispense with unnecessary "emendations." Hence we are driven back on Schneider's alternative—Vitruvius' deficiency in Latin usage. There is one curious piece of evidence that Vitruvius did not write Latin naturally; ordinary words such as *sino*, *vilis*, *odi*, *quomodo*, are not used in the *De architectura*. Hence I cannot agree even with the moderate estimate of Vitruvius' Latinity which commends itself to Mr. Beeson.

Nor am I convinced that my revision of Krohn's text was a mistake. I shall take one single example (ix. 8. 2): "panthium . . . quod etiam [there was a similar building at Syracuse (*Athen.* v. 207)] in Circo Flaminio est positum." Jocundus, unhappily followed by every editor since, read *plinthium*. It is surprising that the coincidence with the description of the ninth region (i.e., Circus Flaminius) in the *Notitia*, as including the Pantheon, should have been overlooked. It was also overlooked that the section of the Pantheon corresponded to the circle of the analemma. It was further overlooked that the application of the analemma in Rome required adjustment as compared with the latitude of Syracuse (cf. Schneider *ad loc.*). Now this application of the analemma made it possible to conduct the sun's ray at the summer solstice

through the center of the circle of which the upper diameter formed the dome of the Pantheon. Unfortunately, what was accurate at Syracuse was wrong at Rome. It has been left to the architect of the war memorial at Sydney to employ a similar method more correctly and to conduct the sun's ray so that it strikes on the monument of the fallen on one day in the year, November 11, i.e., Armistice Day. I do not know whether the architect was helped by my article on this point.¹

Further, the warning of Mr. Beeson that I should have been content with the critical text of Mr. Krohn came a quarter of a century late. I began my collation of the Harleian 2767 in 1911, using Rose's edition as the "vulgate." Krohn's edition appeared in 1912 and was reviewed in the *Classical Review* for 1913 by Professor Dobson (p. 179). The reviewer gathered from Krohn that there were "four existing MSS." I have myself collated fifteen. Krohn meant to say that he had collated H, G, E, S. Neither Krohn nor Rose took account of the scholia of h and e₂. The reviewer regarded Krohn as a conservative editor. In his review of my first volume (*Phil. Woch.*, December, 1932), Krohn proposed to remedy several presumed dislocations of the text and found that more than a thousand additional *loci* needed emendation!

Mr. Beeson, as we have seen, is in agreement with Krohn in attributing to Vitruvius an adequate knowledge of Latin, measured by the usual grammatical standards. I prefer to regard him as a craftsman who had not mastered Latin and almost certainly used Greek as his vernacular. Further, there are traces of Semitic idiom which may be explained by his African associations. In other words, in my opinion we must admit anomalies due to these several causes. I shall take the cases which Mr. Beeson brings forward as demanding justification.

PRAEF. 4 *Litteraturae* is not to be separated from *disciplina*, in Greek, μήτε τήν γραμματικήν, μήτε τήν ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν μαθόν.

PRAEF. 5 Synonyms are often used in the same passage.

PRAEF. 7 The use of *in* before an object, and also with the ablative of place in the next quotation, is probably due to Semitic idiom with the prepositions *le* and *be*.

1.3 The *Thesaurus*, for which my respect is quite moderate, does not persuade me that *deflagrant* is transitive here.

1.3 Vitruvius is talking about physical characteristics. In the next sentence the Nordic race—*quae sub septentrionibus nutriuntur gentes*—is said to owe its fair complexion, *candidi colores*, among its other qualities, to the abundance of moisture. Such a selection of a single instance—a *coloribus*—is peculiarly characteristic of Vitruvius as a craftsman thinker.

2.2 It is to be expected that he will use special cases which, owing to our imperfect knowledge of building technique, will suggest, at first sight, an assimilation to what is more general. It is necessary, therefore, to

¹ "The Greek Origin of the Pantheon," *Journal RIBA*, November 26, 1932.

- visualize the case. "The *scaenae frons* presented to the audience an elaborate architectural façade . . . which usually rose in three stories."² Vitruvius gives the rules for such a stage background (v. 6. 6). I can only recall one reference to a painted background, and this is condemned by Vitruvius. On the other hand, wall-painting was frequent for interior rooms of all kinds. The decorations of dining-rooms would be familiar to the Roman reader. Although, therefore, *scaenis pictis* is possible, *cenis pictis* is not less possible and is the reading of H.
- 3.10 *De lectis per spatia fenestrarum viridia prospiciantur.* The height of the Roman window from the ground is usually so great that it would be impossible for anyone on a couch to see through it. Hence I reject *lectis*.
- 3.9 *Columna* is used as the unit of height. The use of a module is best seen in the description of military engines (x. 10 and 11). We are concerned here with less than a module, which is therefore singular.
- 1.10,11 The uniqueness of Rome justifies the *vero medio* of 10. In 11, *civitas* has a spatial sense, as so often in Caesar; "civitatem et pro loco et pro oppido, etc." (*Gell.* xiii. 7). *Collocare*, with two accusatives, corresponds to *pono* in ecclesiastical Latin with two accusatives; "The divine mind made the territory of the Roman people a unique and duly adjusted region, etc."
- 1.2 The sense of "adjust" for *temperare* is found in Cato *RR* and later writers. "Annonam macelli quotannis temperandam censuit" (*Suet. Tib.* 34), "The price of meat was to be adjusted every year."
- 4.2 *Ea quod*, resumptive use of pronoun, where we should say "he" or "it"; cf. *otios*. "This region, I say, because, etc."
- 4.1 In reading *exspectare* I unfortunately give the spelling of G, who follows H, *expectare*. The reading *spectare* is found in later manuscripts. *Expectare* is read in *Vulgate* (Wordsworth-White).
- 5.2 *Ad conventos excipiundos*: In orthography I have followed the rule of Nohl, "codicum consensus formas plebeias praebentium spernere non licere," especially as the vernacular forms so often go back to antiquity. The argument from the number of regular usages in Vitruvius should not be pressed. For example, he has *angiportorum* three times and *angiportuum* once, in the same context (i. 6). But the irregularities of H may be exaggerated. Professor Housman includes in an Appendix to his *Manilius* "the legitimate variations of the MSS and such of their errors as are not merely barbarous" (V, 162). He gives *curros* for *currus*, *lacos* for *lucus*, *sallos* for *saltus* (p. 168). And, indeed, generally the spelling of my text is to be paralleled from this quarter and from Munro's *Lucretius*, I, 30-37.

II

The variations from H presented by G are largely corrections of spelling in the interests of (presumed) grammar. A reference to Quintilian i. 7. 4 will show that G's spelling *exspecto* (4.1 *supra*) is an attempt to correct H's *ex-*

² Stuart Jones, *Companion to Roman History*, p. 128.

pecto. I regret that my text follows G. This is one of the very many cases in which G's dependence upon H is suggested by the orthographical corrections. I will confess that I have not recorded every variant in spelling such as *ex-pecto:exspecto*, but in the main my text is an exact transcript of H, except for the variants noted below the text. I am indebted to *Classical Philology* for this further vindication of H as the original of G. I deal with the interpolations of G in the Preface to my second volume (p. xliii). In iii. 5. 2 G's interpolation destroyed the description of the Attic base. S followed H, but I regret to say that G's error has appeared in every edition, so far as I know, including my own.

In my second volume I have followed H more closely than in the first. The reading *autem* at 69.15 (Rose) in the first volume for *ut* is unnecessary if we carry on the previous sentence: "so that these columns are placed."

III

I do not follow the argument from paleographical considerations that H, being written by an "insular" scribe, could not display insular readings when copied from an Italian original. The best aid to understanding the affinities of H is found in the spelling of the Codex Amiatinus, itself copied from an Italian original.

For that matter, several of the cases quoted from H by Rose as examples of insular letter confusions (2d ed., Pref., p. iv) are not relevant. *Natio* means "kind," *sc. genus*, as frequently in Pliny *NH*, and *pythmo* is probably a wrong transliteration from the Greek. Again *desepti* is for *decepti* (63.20), a reading supplied, like so many other corrections, by the later MS *e*. *Hypetri* H 96.22: Schneider *ad loc.* is probably right in taking *hypaethri* as meaning the outer air upon which the doorway *lumen* opens. *Thyretri*, suggested by Rose and followed by Krohn, is certainly wrong. *Hypaethri* does not refer to an architectural feature at all. *Excepto* is used as in Pliny *NH* to denote what is stipulated for or specified. Rose therefore exaggerates the insular element in H and, by his formula, removes from the text characteristic technical phrases.

IV

Obviously the text of H could not have survived the kind of revision that we have been examining. It could not have been approved by Alcuin, who revised the Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate. For example, both the Amiatinus and the Fuldensis have *in terrae moto* (Apoc. 11.13). Nestle receives this reading into the text. But *motu* is found in the later manuscripts. The case is parallel with H and G. I infer that H was written before the revision of Alcuin. The insular readings of H, though sometimes confused, as we have seen, with the genuine tradition, are consistent with its Northumbrian origin. I have not been able to find a manuscript later than A.D. 800 which, on the whole, presents characteristics similar to those of H. Mr. Jones, in the paper referred to above, overlooks the semiuncial N in the London Vitruvius (*op.*

cit., p. 69, n. 8). My adherence to H certainly has disregarded some grammatical conventions, but only when, as in the cases discussed above, technical details were at stake, or where traces of the workshop vernacular were obscured. I shall conclude with a challenge.

None of the variations from H presented by G shows any addition to our knowledge of the text beyond more or less obvious grammatical corrections. When the scribe of G went farther than this, he fell into glaring mistakes. And, with G's disappearance, H holds the field.

It would have required a large commentary to deal with the readings of H which I have preferred. But this lay outside the plan of the "Loeb Series." I have been content to compress into a handy form the result of fifty years' study of the text.

FRANK GRANGER

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
NOTTINGHAM, ENGLAND

THE MANUSCRIPT PROBLEM OF VITRUVIUS

The real point at issue between Professor Granger and myself is the place of the Gudianus (G) in the text tradition of Vitruvius. He regards G as derived from the Harleianus (H), or from the Schlettstadt codex (S), saec. X, which is descended from H, though he gives little evidence to support such a claim ("A reference to the critical notes will prove, I think, that G is merely a recension of H carried out in the presumed interest of Latin style" [Pref. to I, xviii]). I am in agreement with Professor Granger's predecessors that G, along with E, another Gudianus, represents an independent branch of the tradition.

In my review I called attention to the philological evidence which pointed to the independence of G (errors, especially omissions in HS, which are not found in G), but I did not go into details. I was more interested in the paleographical evidence, which no one had yet discussed. It seemed to me that this evidence needed only to be stated to produce conviction. Professor Granger missed my point entirely ("I do not follow the argument from paleographical considerations that H being written by an 'insular' scribe could not display insular readings when copied from an Italian original"). I was referring to G, not H. I did not state that either H or G was copied by an Insular scribe. I mentioned specifically one bit of evidence that seemed to me conclusive. The scribe of G copied his MS in the eleventh century. In four passages he wrote the letter *k* three times for *autem* (iii. 2. 6; vi. 8. 10; viii. 3. 21), once for *vero* (iii. 2. 8). But why should an eleventh-century scribe be prompted to write *k*, rather, say, than *x*, *y*, or *z* for *autem*? He would have no more occasion to substitute *k* for *autem* than Professor Granger or myself if we were copying a page of Vitruvius. To anyone, however, who is familiar with the troubles caused to Continental scribes by Insular abbreviations, the answer is easy.

In the present case the scribe of G himself furnishes the explanation, for in three other passages he wrote the Insular symbol for *autem* (*h* with a hook on the shoulder) in its correct form. Now this symbol passed out of use on the Continent about the middle of the ninth century, long before G was written, and could not have originated with the scribe of G. It must, therefore, have stood in the archetype of G. This archetype could not have been H or S, for neither of these MSS has the symbol; similarly, at iii. 2. 8 G's original must have had *hr*; G could not have had it from H, since this codex has *vero* at this point. Again, G wrote *oportereāt* (vii. Pr. 7) for *oportere autem*. He could not have got the reading from H, since the words are clearly indicated in this MS. The explanation is that he saw the Anglo-Saxon abbreviation for *autem* (*āt*) in his exemplar and slavishly copied it without understanding. G has preserved other obsolete symbols, which are found occasionally in Insular MSS; e.g., $\overline{\overline{\text{J}}}$, for *contra* three times (fols. 28v., 37v, 70v) and *q:* for *quae* twice (fols. 33, 38). The Insular abbreviation for *post* (*p̄*) must have stood in the archetype of G and E at x. 16. 6, 7; the scribe of G copied what he saw, but the scribe of E, a gemellus of G, not being familiar with the form, expanded it incorrectly as *praeter*, which was frequently abbreviated as *p̄*. These abbreviations are not found in H, which cannot therefore have been the exemplar of G.

The philological proof that G is not a copy of H is equally convincing. The best evidence is furnished by omissions in H. I cite a few passages where homoioteleuton is involved. The words omitted in H (and, with one exception, in the Loeb text) are printed in italics; the translations are those of Professor Granger.

- iii. 5. 2. *Dempta plintho reliquum dividatur in partes quattuor, fiatque superior torus quartae; reliquae tres aequaliter dividantur, et una sit inferior torus, altera pars cum suis quadris scotia.*

Professor Granger bracketed the italicized words in the text but included them in the translation; later he rejected the passage (Pref. to II, xlvi). The Vitruvius of G seems to be a better architect and a better Latinist. At any rate, his specifications are more specific; they correspond to those given for the Ionic base six lines below:

Reliquum praeter plinthum, quod erit tertia pars crassitudinis columnae, dividatur in partes septem: inde trium partium torus qui est in summo; reliquae quattuor partes dividendae sunt aequaliter, et una pars fiat cum suis astragalus et supercilio superior trochilus, altera pars inferiori trochilo relinquantur.

- iv. 1. 7, 8. *Ita duobus discriminibus columnarum inventionem unam virili sine ornatu nuda specie, alteram muliebri subtilitate et ornatu symmetriaque sunt mutuati. posterius vero elegantia subtilitateque iudiciorum progressi et gracilioribus modulis delectati . . . constituerunt.*

- iv. 1. 7, 8. Thus they proceeded to the invention of columns in two manners; one manlike in appearance, bare, unadorned, the other feminine. Advancing in the subtlety of their judgments and preferring slighter modules, they fixed, etc.

There is no verb for the first sentence; two distinct stages in the development of the columns are combined into one.

vii. Pr. 14. *Quorum ex commentariis, quae utilia esse his rebus animadverti, collecta in unum coegi corpus, et ideo maxime, quod animadverti in ea re ab Graecis volumina plura edita, ab nostris oppido quam pauca.*

vii. Pr. 14. As to the useful contributions to our subject which I found in their commentaries, many volumes have been published by the Greeks, etc.

The superiority of the fuller version is obvious; the *ex*-phrase which is natural with *collecta* is forced in the Loeb text.

ix. 2. 2. Septimo die (cum) sol sit ad occidentem, luna autem inter orientem et occidentem medias caeli teneat regiones.

Rose inserted *cum* (four *cum*-clauses, in indirect discourse, preceded). Professor Granger omits *cum* as well as the italics and translates, "On the seventh day let the sun be towards the west; the moon occupies the middle region of the sky." A queer rendering; *luna* has to be supplied as the subject of *teneat*, which is translated as an indicative.

We should like to know what monastery in the ninth or tenth century could have produced a scholar with such a knowledge of the subject and such a command of Latin that he could perpetrate interpolations like these, with faultless sense and syntax, so accurately dovetailed in the text that one would never have suspected them except for the fact that they are omitted in H. And, most surprising of all, the last word of the interpolation in three passages is the same as the last word in the text preceding the interpolation, and in one case the first word of the interpolation is the same as the first word in the text following the interpolation. One might be willing to admit in a single instance that this might have happened by accident, but to assume that this accident happened at least four times is to stretch coincidence to the breaking-point. It is not clear either why it should occur to anyone to make an interpolation at these points. Professor Granger suggests that at vii. Pr. 14 it was caused by the omission of *sunt*; it would have been much simpler to insert *sunt* instead of the ten words actually found. We must conclude, therefore, that these passages are not interpolated but that they were omitted in H by haplography and that G represents a genuine and independent tradition. Other probable examples of haplography in H are: vii. 5. 3, *improban-tur. Nam pinguntur* (in pointed brackets in the Loeb text); viii. 1. 2, *certiores et stabiliores*; cf., a few lines below, *et copiosae et bonae* and *uberiores et affluentiores* and *frigidiores sunt et salubriores*; viii. 6. 15, *salubriorem et suaviorem*; cf. viii. 1. 6, *et suaviora et salubriora et copiosiora*. Another omission in H where Professor Granger assumes interpolation ("both inaccurate and superfluous") in G occurs at iii. 3. 7, *ipsarum columnarum altitudo modu-lorum VIII et dimidia moduli partis. ita ex ea divisione intercolumnia altitudinesque columnarum habebunt iustam rationem*. The fuller version makes better sense and provides a plural subject for *habebunt*; it furnishes a

real meaning for *iustam rationem*. The fact that G has *VIII* instead of *VIII* tends rather to support than to refute the assumption of genuineness; the error arose in the course of the transmission of the text. Similar errors in numerals occur elsewhere in Vitruvius.

The preceding examples furnish a sufficient answer to Professor Granger's challenge. But the question is not, as he puts it, whether "the variations from H presented by G show any addition to our knowledge of the text beyond more or less obvious grammatical corrections." The important question is whether G is independent of H or not. After this point has been decided we may ask what the *contributions* of G are. Further evidence that G did make contributions to the text is furnished by the fact that Professor Granger admits into his edition well over three hundred readings of G where H is clearly wrong. These alleged "corrections" are not "mainly grammatical" or "largely corrections of spelling" (Professor Granger makes both statements), as the following selection of readings will show (the right reading of G is followed by the error of H in parentheses): i. 1. 16, *trigonis* (*tridonis*); 2. 2, *solis* (*solis*); 2. 4, *ratae* (*latae*); 4. 9, *censeo rationem* (*cense orationem* G, *censet rationem* H); 6. 2, *aqua* (*qua*); 6. 8, *exclusa erit* (*excluserit*); 6. 12, *parem* (*partem*); 7. 2, *cereri* (*cerei*); ii. 1. 1, *propius* (*proprius*); 2. 1, *aera* (*aerea*); 3. 1, *inbribus* (*intribus*); 4. 3, *ea ruunt* (*earunt*); 8. 4, *orthostatas* (*orchostatas*); 8. 11, *locum* (*loco cum*); 8. 13, *mausolus* (*manu solus*); iii. 1. 3, *pansas* (*spansas*); 3. 2, *systylos* (*stylos*); 3. 6, *eustyli* (*estyli*); 3. 10, *eustyli* (*custyli*); 3. 12, *scapus* (*capus*); *imus* (*is*); 4. 2, *congesticius* (*coniesticius*); *paluster* (*plaster*); *configatur* (*configatur*); 4. 4, *dextante* (*extantae*); iv. 1. 7, *strias* (*istrias*); 2. 5, *ferunt* (*fuertunt*); *stillicidia* (*stillicia*); 4. 1, *habuerit* (*habeterit*); 6. 3, *ima luminis* (*simalum in his*); v. Pr. 3, *quique* (*quinque*); 1. 6, *coloniae* (*columniae*); 5. 2, *neten* (*netent*); 6. 2, *scaena* (*caena*); 9. 4, *una* (*om.* H); 9. 5, *extenuat* (*extenuati*); 10. 1, *caldaria* (*calcaria*); vi. 1. 5, *schema* (*scaena*); 2. 2, *ecphorae* (*esphorae*); 3. 4, *alis* (*aliis*); 3. 11, *tunc erit* (*tenerit*); 7. 7, *ergo* (*ero*); 8. 2, *insidere* (*insidera*); vii. Pr. 12, *monopteros* (*monocteros*); 16, *cereris* (*caeteris*); 1. 1, *congesticius* (*coniesticius*); 1. 3, *pinsatione* (*piscatione*); *rudus* (*inrudus*); 3. 1, *tecta erunt* (*tecter*); 3. 2, *duos* (*uos*); 3. 9, *incertas et* (*incerta. sed*); 4. 3, *cogat* (*cogitat*); 4. 4, *seu miniaeis* (*se ominiaeis*);¹ 5. 1, *certae rationes* (*caelerationes*); 5. 2, *fastigiorum* (*fastidiorum*); 6. 1, *procreantur* (*procrehentur*); 7. 5, *ponto sandaraca* (*pontos andarea*); 9. 5, *minium* (*minimum*); 9. 6, *nominius* (*in omnibus*); 10. 2, *ne* (*nec*); 14. 1, *aqua* (*quam*); viii. Pr. 1, *de aere* (*de hacre*); 2. 6, *colchis* (*conchis*); 2. 9, *calor eius* (*calcoleius*); 3. 3, *compressa ruunt* (*conpraesserunt*); 3. 15, *propius* (*proprius*); 3. 14, *ilienses* (*nilienses*); 3. 23, *susis* (*suesis*); 5. 3, *si* (*sic*); 6. 4, *CXX* (*CCXX*); 6. 10, *quin* (*qui in*); 6. 14, *signinis* (*signis*); ix. Pr. 2, *suos* (*uos*); 6, *tertia* (*terua*); 11, *labra* (*libra*); 1. 2, *architectata* (*architecta*); 1. 14, *circinationem* (*circitionem*); 2. 3, *aristarchus* (*arhistartus*); 7. 1, *locis* (*lonis*); 8. 3, *compressione* (*confressione*); 8. 12, *labro*

¹ The archetype of H evidently had *seo* (the vulgar form of *seu*) *miniaeis*.

(libro); cancri (caneri); x. 3. 3, *propius* (*proprius*); 7. 1, *foramina narium* (*foraminarium*); 12. 2, *partem* (*parietem*).

Such "corrections" as these could not have been made by a scribe *currente calamo* and some of them are beyond anyone's power of divination; e.g., *CCXX* corrected to *CXX*. The inference is that these readings of G are genuine. One passage is sufficient to show that G did not correct the reading of H: at v. 4. 5 the text reads *proslambanomenos, hypate hypaton, hypate meson, mese, nete synhemmenon*; H has *iros lambanomenos hypate hypato hypateon meson mesen & esyn exemmene*;² G reads *proslamba nomenos hypate hipaton. hypatemeson. mese. netesynem|mene*. Neither scribe knew the meaning of the words; but the garbled forms in G are closer to the original. This cannot be due to emendation on the part of G since his forms still remain garbled and meaningless.

The contributions of G to the text would appear still more numerous if one followed the edition of Rose or of Krohne rather than the Loeb edition. Since the readings of G are independent, they deserve a more favorable consideration than Professor Granger has given them. They should be tested on the basis of normal Latin usage and the usage of Vitruvius. While it is admitted that Vitruvius often departs from the classical idiom, it is not sound method arbitrarily to assume a "vulgarism" in order to defend the reading of H against the normal reading of G. In matters of orthography the vulgar spelling may be that of the scribe rather than that of Vitruvius. It is not always easy to find sound stylistic tests. Professor Granger himself cites as evidence that Vitruvius did not write Latin naturally the fact that he did not use "ordinary words such as *sino*, *vilis*, *odi*, and *quomodo*." This is a singularly unfortunate test. Caesar also, who certainly did write Latin naturally, did not use *vilis* or *quomodo*; *sino* occurs once in one group of MSS, but the recent editors (Meusel, Klotz and Holmes) adopt the reading of the other group, *pator* (which is frequent in Vitruvius); *odi* does occur twice in Caesar, but what occasion would Vitruvius have to use the word? Professor Granger's conception of the language of Vitruvius is stated in very general terms. He refers to "the affinity of the Western Church with Vitruvius" (Pref., I, xiv), to the connection of Vitruvius with Africa,³ to the affiliation of H with the Amiatinus, and to the influence of Semitic idiom. But in actual practice he generally assumes vulgar idiom only when he wishes to defend the readings of H. Professor Granger states that in matters of orthography he followed the rule of Nohl. But he did not follow the spirit of Nohl, to whom the *consensus codicum* meant HG. Nohl does not admit such spellings as *congressos*, *motos*, and *sensos* to his Index. Professor Granger could have chosen no better model as a text critic than Professor Housman but unfortunately he did not follow

² *nete synemmene* according to the Loeb text.

³ If Professor Granger is going to raise the ghost of "African Latin," he should cite later authorities than Cardinal Wiseman and Lachmann.

his model. Professor Housman in his *Manilius* properly relegated such spellings as *curros*, *lacos*, and *salto*s to an Appendix and did not admit them into his text.

In any case, the fact that G has *expectare* where H has *expectare* cannot be regarded as a "further vindication of H as the original of G"; the scribe of G could have changed *exp-* to *exsp-* equally well whether he was copying H or (as is certainly the case) another manuscript.

There is no need of an extended argument in regard to the date of H. Professor Granger thinks that H represents the genuine text and was copied before 779, and so escaped revision at the hands of Carolingian scribes. He further connects H with the Codex Amiatinus, and asserts that it was copied by Italian scribes at Jarrow. H can be dated by any experienced paleographer from the facsimiles found in the *Catalogue of Ancient MSS in the British Museum*, II, Plate LV, where the date is given as "late 9c."; in *Speculum*, VII (1932), 64; and in Jones, *The Script of Cologne*, Plate LXXXIX. He would be a bold paleographer who would assign it to the eighth century, and bolder still who would call the script Italian. Rose, who knew MSS, called the script German, and Jones dates it about the middle of the ninth century; he thinks it was written at Cologne. The MS cannot possibly have anything to do with the Amiatinus, which was copied ca. 700 and was taken to Rome by English pilgrims from Jarrow ca. 718. The tradition of Vitruvius is German. The best MSS are German; the only mention of Vitruvius in medieval catalogues in the ninth century is from Reichenau and Murbach. Fulda also must have had a copy since this author was known to Einhard. Any of these centers might have had the Insular archetype from which the surviving MSS have descended. The original may have been brought to the Rhine country from England, but there is no evidence for such an assumption.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A NOTE ON PLATO *REPUBLIC* v. 450b. 3: *χρυσσοχόσοντας*

The word *χρυσσοχόσοντας* in the fifth book of the *Republic* has caused perplexity in antiquity, as in modern times. No adequate explanation of the word itself has been offered, and the interruption of Thrasymachus seems very pointless.¹

If it is taken in close connection with a passage in the first book, a rich background of content for the word will become clear, and our respect for Plato as a literary stylist will be heightened. In this passage Thrasymachus, who is savagely caricatured as an ill-bred and offensive "Sophist," demands, in violent language, that Socrates should tell him what τὸ δίκαιον is. And he adds a caution:

¹ See Liddell and Scott, s.v. *χρυσσοχόω*; Adam, *Republic of Plato*, I, 276 n.

καὶ ὅπως μοι ἡ εἰς ὅτι τὸ δέον ἐστὶν μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ ὠφέλιμον μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ λυσιτελοῦν μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ κερδαλέον μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ συμφέρον ἀλλὰ σαφῶς μοι καὶ ἀκριβῶς λέγε ὅτι ἂν λέγῃς· ὡς ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀποδέχομαι ἐὰν ἔθλους τοιοῦτους λέγῃς.

Socrates treats him with playful irony, pretends to cringe in terror and is saved from being turned dumb by this savage wolf only by the fact that he has looked upon him first. And then Socrates becomes somewhat σέμνος and continues in the following vein:

"ὦ Θρασύμαχε, μὴ χαλεπὸς ἡμῖν ἴσθι· εἰ γάρ τί ἐξαμαρτάνομεν ἐν τῇ τῶν λόγων σκέψει ἐγὼ τε καὶ ὅδε, εὖ ἴσθι ὅτι ἅκοντες ἀμαρτάνομεν. μὴ γάρ δὴ οἶον, εἰ μὲν χρυσίον ἐζητοῦμεν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἡμᾶς ἐκόντας εἶναι ὑποκατακλίνεσθαι ἀλλήλοις ἐν τῇ ζητῆσει καὶ διαφθεῖρειν τὴν εὐρεσιν αὐτοῦ, δικαιοσύνην δὲ ζητοῦντας, πρᾶγμα πολλῶν χρυσίων τιμιώτερον, ἔπειθ' οὕτως ἀνόητως ὑπέκειν ἀλλήλοις καὶ οὐ σπουδάζειν ὅτι μάλιστα φανῇαι αὐτό.²

If the search were for gold, no trouble would be too much. But justice is much more precious than gold. Shall we then be remiss in our search?

As the argument of the first book proceeds, Thrasymachus is tricked and buffeted into submission, and sits in sullen quiescence while Socrates, Glaucon, and Adeimantus build in imagination the kallipolitan state.³ And then at the beginning of the fifth book he speaks again for the first and last time in the whole dialogue. His interjection comes at the end of a bit of playful badinage, such as Plato frequently slips in between two difficult arguments:

"Shall we let him off?" whispers Glaucon, "or what shall we do?" "Not at all," said Adeimantus in normal tones. "What won't you let off?" said I. "You," he said. "What have I said?" said I. "You have dodged a whole and important section of the argument about the possession of women and the rearing of children. You are proceeding to consider another polity before you have sufficiently dealt with this problem. We vote that you should not be allowed to pass on before you have dealt with this." "I, too, will vote with them," said Thrasymachus.⁴

Οἶον, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, εἰργάσασθε ἐπιλαβόμενοι μου. ὅσον λόγον πάλιν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, κινεῖτε περὶ τῆς πολιτείας· ἦν ὡς ἤδη διεληλυθὼς ἔγωγ' ἔχαιρον, ἀγαπῶν εἰ τις ἑάσοι ταῦτα ἀποδεξάμενος ὡς τότε ἐρρήθη. ἃ νῦν ὑμεῖς παρακαλοῦντες οὐκ ἴστε ὅσον ἐσμὸν λόγων ἐπεγείρετε· ὃν ὁρῶν ἐγὼ παρήκα τότε, μὴ παράσχωι πολὺν ὄχλον.

Τί δέ; ἦ δ' ὅς Θρασύμαχος· χρυσοχοήσοντας οἶε τοῖσδε νῦν ἐνθάδε ἀφίχθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ λόγων ἀκουσομένους;

Ναί, εἶπον, μετρίων γε.

Μέτρον δέ γ', ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὁ Γλαῦκων, τοιοῦτων λόγων ἀκούειν ὅλος ὁ βίος νοῦν ἔχουσιν.⁵

² 336 D-E.

³ I can see no reason for Adam's suggestion (*loc. cit.*) that "Thrasymachus and Socrates are now reconciled." The last remark of Thrasymachus in Book i, ταῦτα δὲ σοι, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, εἰστιάσθω ἐν τοῖς Βενιδίδειος, seems to me sullen—by no means a joyful conversion to Socrates' position.

⁴ 449c-50. I paraphrase roughly.

⁵ 450A and B.

"I had dreaded," Socrates implies, "so long, involved and difficult an argument." "Do you think," said Thrasymachus, "that these have come here gold smelting and not listening to arguments?"

It is a neat riposte. The *σεμνότης* of Socrates' protestation in the first book is neatly turned against him in the fifth, and Glaucon is left to underline the obvious in language such as Socrates himself had frequently used.

Subtleties like this modify one's conception of Plato's treatment of the Sophists. It is distinctly comforting to find that the Thrasymachus, who is treated in such cavalier fashion at the opening of the dialogue, is allowed at a later stage in the work to make an effective rejoinder.

A. D. WINSPEAR

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

DOLON'S DISGUISE IN THE *RHESUS*

In the *Rhesus* the ruse of the spy Dolon by which he fully expects to deceive the sentinels of the Greek army encamped before Troy is to don a wolf's skin, *λύκειον δорάν*, and scalp, *χάσμα θήρας*, and to approach the enemy lines on all fours when there is any possibility of being seen, but in deserted places to walk erect like a man.¹ The Homeric version² of the story differs from the Euripidean in that Dolon is not disguised. He wears the wolf's skin just as Herakles wears a lion's skin. Euripides has availed himself of an obvious opportunity to pun by making the disguise of Dolon a justification of his name, and has thrown the pun into high relief by placing the word *δόλος* at the very end of the passage descriptive of the ruse.³ The first word, *λύκειον*, of the passage defines the last word, *δόλος*.

The point of the ruse is that, should Dolon successfully mimic the gait of a wolf, *λύκος*, he could safely pass the Argive sentinels because the beast was sacred to their Apollo who bore the appellative *Λύκειος* at Argos as well as at Athens.⁴ While the chorus of Trojan sentinels expresses the wish that Hermes attend the spy on his dangerous mission, it is possible that Dolon completed his disguise by adjusting the wolf's scalp upon his head. As he leaves the stage the chorus makes a significant appeal to the Apollo of Thymbra, Delos, and Lycia to protect him (vss. 224 ff.), significant because two, if not all three, of these places knew the wolfish character of Apollo. When his mother Leto was about to give birth on the island of Delos she

¹ *Rhesus* 208-15.

² *Iliad* x. 334; cf. W. H. Porter, *The "Rhesus" of Euripides*, p. xi.

³ Although Homer does not play upon the name, there is perhaps an intimation that Dolon's craftiness was a family tradition. Dolon and his father Eumedes seem like personifications of *δόλους και μήδεα* (*Iliad* iii. 202).

⁴ Cf. Fraser, *Paus.*, II, p. 195; Soph. *Electra* 6-7; Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. ii. 123; Servius ad Aen. IV. 377: "sed cum Danaus lupum videret vicisse, Apollini Lycio templum dedit."

was transformed into a wolf.⁵ Delos had close ties with Lycia "wolf-land." It may be more than a coincidence that Dolon, according to Homer,⁶ in giving the position of the Trojan allies places the Lycians at Thymbra on the river Thymbris. For the latter name is the same as Tiber, on the banks of which river the divine she-wolf suckled the twins. Possibly this theriomorphic deity had originally roamed the banks of the Trojan Tiber. The appeal to the wolfish Apollo to protect the wolfish Dolon is as appropriate as the advice of Athena to Pandarus, the son of Lycaon who came from Lycia to Troy, that he pray for aid to Apollo *λυκηγενής*.⁷

When Dolon began his description of his ruse with the word *λύκειον*, many of the Athenians must have been reminded of their own Apollo *Λύκειος* whose sanctuary near the *Λύκειον* on the slopes of *Λυκα-βηττός*, "wolf-haunt," was ancient enough to have been the scene of the battle between the Athenians and the Amazons.⁸ Certainly the priest of Apollo *Λύκειος* who had a seat in the front row of the theater at Athens could hardly have missed the suggestiveness of that initial *λύκειον*, and the appropriateness of placing the wolfish Dolon under the protection of the wolfish Apollo.⁹

G. W. ELDERKIN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

A NOTE ON SENECA *APOCOLOCYNTOSIS* vii. 1

Tum Hercules, "audi me," inquit, "tu desine fatuari. Venisti huc, ubi mures ferrum rodunt. Citius mihi verum, ne tibi alogias excutiam."

The clause *ubi mures ferrum rodunt* appears to need greater precision in its interpretation than has hitherto obtained. In view of the context it is no doubt intended to be treated as a piece of slang or a rough colloquialism, though whether it was actually such or not is something we cannot settle. Professor Ball suggests that it "is possibly coined by Seneca himself";¹ I shall hope to show later that it would be better to say, "given by Seneca the twist of meaning it must here bear." Otto, including it among his proverbs of the Roman people, interprets it thus in connection with *venisti huc*: "Hier bist du gefangen, wie die Maus in der Falle";² but the expression *ubi mures ferrum rodunt* evidently is intended to establish a *differentiation* between the world in which Claudius has lived and that into which he has come, and there is no differentiation established by referring to mouse traps. Further, I do not find in the Latin any suggestion of "bist du gefangen." Professor Ball

⁵ Arist. *Hist. anim.* vi. 35.

⁷ *Ibid.* iv. 101.

⁶ *Iliad* x. 430.

⁸ Plutarch *Theseus* 27.

⁹ The extant marble seat in the Athenian theater bearing the inscription *Ἀπόλλωνος Λυκίου* (CIA, III, No. 292) is late, but it is a safe assumption, in view of the antiquity of the cult, that this seat replaced an earlier one.

¹ A. P. Ball, *The Satire of Seneca* (New York, 1902), p. 67.

² A. Otto, *Sprichwörter der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 234.

paraphrases Otto's idea thus: "Now, Claudius, you have walked into a place where you will get caught."³ Surely it is a strange way of putting that to say: "You have come to a place where mice get caught." That was at least equally true of the world Claudius had just left. It is because Professor Ball translates the *venisti huc* honestly that his explanation fails.

Buecheler's earlier exegesis runs thus: "Herkules meint: Wo es anders als im gewöhnlichen Erdenleben zugeht und auch das Kleinste fürchterlich wird; er sucht damit den furchtsamen Claudius zu ängstigen."⁴ But in his note on Herondas iii. 75-76, written many years later, he takes a different line: "Ubi nihil est hominum neque humanitatis."⁵ Headlam accepts this interpretation of the Senecan phrase in his own note to the Herondas passage,⁶ but he is no doubt influenced to concur because it happens to satisfy the various mouse-and-iron parallels which he quotes in his own extensive commentary. It also suits the relevant passages in Pliny the Elder,⁷ in both of which we hear of the inhabitants of Gyara being chased from their island by hordes of mice, which finally, in default of anything else to eat such as the presence of humanity generally provides them, took to gnawing iron. In fact, Pliny's story is no doubt the basis of Buecheler's later explanation of the Senecan passage.

But if, as Professor Ball and Professor René Waltz⁸ suspect, the phrase is specially coined for the occasion, all these parallel or illustrative passages are more likely to mislead than to help us. What we have to think of is the bearing of the phrase *in the passage under consideration*; and Professor Ball has appreciated that, as evidenced by another sentence from the note already quoted: "This seems calculated to impress the timid Claudius with the strenuousness of life in the region to which he had come,"⁹—in effect Buecheler's earlier explanation over again. Precisely, but one could be more definite about it.

Consider the drift of Hercules' remarks: "Listen to me. Stop your silly talk. Quick, out with the truth, or I'll knock the nonsense out of you." He is trying to frighten Claudius by impressing on him the fact that he has come to a rough and tough place—a place, in fact, *where mice chew iron*. In a place where mice chew iron, what might not be expected of a Hercules in the way of violence? So Claudius had better beware. I have frequently heard in western Canada and in several of the western United States the expression "he looked tough enough to bite nails"; and from the student paper of my own university I cull this recent heading: "Tough Guy Chewed Nails." A locality where mice "chewed nails" would be a bad place for anyone who fell

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁴ *Symbola philologorum Bonnensium*, fasc. 1 (1864), p. 51.

⁵ In his edition of Herondas (1892).

⁶ W. Headlam, *Herondas* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 153.

⁷ viii. 29. 104 and viii. 57. 222.

⁸ *L'apocoloquintose du divin Claude* (Paris, 1934), p. 21 nn.: "Il se peut aussi qu'Hercule l'imagine pour terroriser l'impressionnable Claude."

⁹ *Vis.*, *The Satire of Seneca*, p. 184.

foul of the larger inhabitants. This interpretation seems to me to fit the passage like a glove and to possess the advantage of taking the words as they stand.

My own belief is that *ubi mures ferrum rodunt* is in no sense a literary reminiscence with Seneca, nor yet a mental child of his own, but rather the recollection of a turn of language in the *sermo vulgaris*; further, that while the phrase was no doubt employed at times to indicate a poverty-stricken region, it could have another and perhaps less obvious meaning, such as I have set out above.¹⁰ For this second meaning the contextual association is, in my judgment, determinative: "You have come to a place where the very mice [are so tough that they] chew iron"—evidently no spot for *alogiae*.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

A FORGOTTEN EMENDATION OF STRABO XVI. 4. 10

Strabo (xvi. 4. 10), in speaking of the "elephant-eaters" on the Red Sea, describes in the following words the manner in which those hunters who kill the elephants with poisoned arrows shoot the bow: ἡ δὲ τοξεία διὰ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν συντελείται, τῶν μὲν κατεχόντων τὸ τόξον καὶ προβεβηκότων τοῖς ποσὶ, τοῦ δ' ἑλκοντος τὴν νευράν. The text has stood unchanged, and apparently unquestioned, since the edition of Corais (1815); editions before that date I have not consulted. As for the meaning of the passage, it is clear that two men hold the bow securely and the third draws the string, but what further are the two men doing, *προβεβηκότων τοῖς ποσὶ*? The interpretations of the two editors in the last century who have accompanied the Greek text with a translation are not convincing: *duo arcum tenent, et pedibus praepositis nituntur* (I am not sure just what this expression precisely means), *tertius vero nervum trahit* (Müller-Dübner); "two of these [persons] step to the front and hold the bow, and the third draws the string" (Jones).

If *προβεβηκότων τοῖς ποσὶ* is allowed to stand, it might possibly mean "with their feet advanced," i.e., each man advancing a foot in order to steady himself; but the question naturally arises, Who would (or could?) ever shoot a bow in any other way than with one foot before the other?

Wesseling in his edition of Diodorus Siculus (Amsterdam, 1746), *ad* iii. 8. 4, suggested that in this passage in Strabo *προσβεβηκότων* be read for *προβεβηκότων*, and with that emendation the words are clear: two men hold

¹⁰ Thus in Horace *Sat.* i. 4. 10 the phrase *stans pede in uno* seems clear enough in its interpretation relative to the context, though we have no parallel for it in extant Latin literature; in other words, it is possible to deduce from the context the meaning that a phrase must carry even though we cannot furnish a parallel for it, and indeed even if apparent parallels are unsatisfactory or contradictory.

the bow securely, "putting their foot against it." The use of *προσβαίνω* in the sense of "put one's foot against" is as old as Homer, and this manner of holding the bow firmly is attested by the following passages:

Diodorus iii. 8. 4. writing about Ethiopians on the Upper Nile: *καθοπλίζονται . . . ξυλίνοις τόξοις τετραπήχεσιν, οἷς τοξεύουσι μὲν τῷ ποδὶ προσβαίνοντες. . . .*

Agatharchides *De mari erythraeo* 54 (ed. C. Müller), writing about the "elephant-hunters": *ἐπὰν οὖν προσάγῃ τὸ ζῷον, ὃ μὲν εἰς κατέχει τὸ τόξον τῷ ποδὶ προσβεβηκώς, οἱ δὲ δύο τὴν νευρὰν ἐλκύσαντες ἐκ τῆς ἀπάσης βίας ἀφῆκαν τὸ βέλος.*

Xenophon *Anab.* iv. 2. 28, describing the Carduchian bowmen: *εἰλκον δὲ τὰς νευρὰς ὅποτε τοξεύουεν πρὸς τὸ κάτω τοῦ τόξου τῷ ἀριστερῷ ποδὶ προσβαίνοντες. . . .* Here the earlier hand (C₁) of the Codex Parisinus, which is the source from which were copied the other manuscripts of the superior of the two groups into which the extant manuscripts of the *Anabasis* fall, wrote *προσβαίνοντες*; the later hand or hands (C₂), whose additions and changes are usually "for the worse" (Brownson), changed this to *προβαίνοντες*, which is the reading of all the other manuscripts. But recent editors, such as Marchant, Goodwin-White, Brownson, prefer, and properly, the reading *προσβαίνοντες*.

Arrian *Indica* xvi. 6 also illustrates this way of holding the bow firmly, *ἀντιβαίνω* being used in essentially the same sense as *προσβαίνω*: *τὸ τόξον . . . κάτω ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν θέντες καὶ τῷ ποδὶ ἀριστερῷ ἀντιβάντες, οὕτως ἐκτοξεύουσι. . . .*

C. H. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

THE HORACE CHECK-LIST

A check-list of the Horace holdings in the United States is being prepared under the direction of Mr. Ernest Kletsch, curator of union catalogues, of the Library of Congress.

As a project in commemoration of the bi-millennium of the poet, the department of classics of Mills College is undertaking to edit and publish this important bibliographical material. It is hoped that the holdings of private collectors, of institutions of learning, and of public libraries will be listed and accurately checked during the present summer so that printing can go forward in the autumn. Institutions and individuals owning significant editions of Horace or Horatian material not yet listed are urged to communicate directly with Mr. Kletsch.

ANNA COX BRINTON

MILLS COLLEGE, CALIFORNIA

BOOK REVIEWS

Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen: Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens, Teil I. By ULRICH KAHRESTEDT. ("Göttinger Forschungen," Vol. IV.) Stuttgart-Berlin: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. v+370. RM. 24.

In 1928 Professor Kahrstedt had ready for publication a voluminous work on Athenian constitutional antiquities. As economic difficulties in Germany at that time prevented him from finding a publisher willing to undertake the burden, he turned to the United States. Unfortunately, however, before his negotiations with the University of Michigan Press were completed, the depression here closed that door also. Now after several years a publisher has agreed to bring the work out in instalments. The first of them is before us, and the others are to follow as rapidly as the multitudinous duties of a professor in the new *Reich* permit. As compensation for these delays we are promised that full consideration will be given to recent epigraphical studies, and in particular to the numerous inscriptions which are coming to light in the Agora.

In this first fascicle Kahrstedt discusses at length two related aspects of Athenian sovereignty—the territory over which the state had control and the people who lived within its boundaries. In the first chapter ("Das Staatsgebiet") the author begins with a survey of Athenian holdings. Here he considers the frontiers of Attica (summarizing his article on this subject in *Ath. Mitt.*, 1932, pp. 8 ff.), the perioecic communities (Salamis, Eleutherae, Oropus, Plataea), and the colonial possessions. For a detailed discussion of the extent and development of the Athenian colonial empire readers must refer to Kahrstedt's article "Der Umfang des athenischen Kolonialreiches" (*Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1931, pp. 159–95). Since statements made by Kahrstedt in his new book depend for their validity upon evidence presented in this article, I need offer no apologies for considering the two together here, particularly as Kahrstedt seems inclined to go farther than the evidence warrants, at times using as proof restorations and conjectural interpretations. For example, Eteokarpathos is listed as an Athenian colony during the fifth century on the evidence of *IG*, XII, 1, 977, an inscription which, except for a tentative suggestion made by Dinsmoor, now withdrawn, has been assigned to the fourth century. Still, even though we accept Kahrstedt's date and admit that the inscription is evidence for the existence in Eteokarpathos of a shrine belonging to the tutelary goddess of Athens—an interpretation with which I cannot agree—we may still question whether the existence of such a shrine would be sure proof that the territory of the city had been confiscated by Athens and assigned to

Athenian klerouchs. Similarly, it is doubtful whether Kythnos should be included in our roster of Athenian colonies simply because the Eleusinian goddesses received an income from rents in that island (*ibid.*, I³, 313). The evidence for Tyrodiza is *ibid.*, 375, a document the interpretation of which is problematic. Passing on now to other minor matters, we can substitute the name Astakos for the unknown Letanon of Diod. xii. 34, an easy paleographical metamorphosis. Geraistos does not appear in the quota lists, for its restoration in *ibid.*, 216, was erroneous. The Kallipolis of the quota lists is probably not Gallipoli in the Chersonese. On the other hand, Neapolis, hitherto located in the Chersonese, may well be located elsewhere, as Kahrstedt suggests.

A much more fundamental question is this: To what extent did Athens confiscate the territory of cities to which colonies were sent? Kahrstedt's answer is based partly upon the statement of Andocides that two-thirds of Euboea was owned by Athens, partly upon Thucydides' account of the treatment of Lesbos after its revolt, and partly upon the well-known Athenian decree (*ibid.*, 39) regulating the affairs of Chalkis after the Euboean revolt of 446. (The fact that Archestratos, who moved a rider to this decree, was secretary of the Boule in 442-1 [*ibid.*, 358] and that the final Eretrian settlement was made in that year leads me to suggest that the Chalkidian decree should be dated then.) Kahrstedt's interpretation of the document is a novel one, for he concludes that Chalkis, and by inference other states to which klerouchs were sent, ceased to exist except as communities of tenants holding their land in precarious tenure from the Athenians. In other words, if Athens had no immediate need for the confiscated land, the original inhabitants continued to cultivate their plots as renters rather than owners. That many of these communities continued to appear on the quota list as Athenian tributaries, Kahrstedt argues, is no objection to his thesis, for the tribute can be regarded as a recognition of Athenian ownership of their land. The thesis has much to commend it, and it finds some support in Kahrstedt's interpretation of the broken Hestiaia decree (*ibid.*, 41) in which certain privileges are granted to the Elopian inhabitants of northern Euboea. On the other hand, there are difficulties which we cannot discuss here. In passing, be it noted that Kahrstedt believes that the territory of Samos after its revolt in 440 was confiscated like that of the rebels in Lesbos later. In speaking of the settlement in Lesbos he seems to imply that the Athenian klerouchs remained in Athens, contrary to an apparently explicit statement in Thucydides; and he interprets the Mytilenaeen decree (*ibid.*, 60) as a validation of the sale of *kleroi* to native Mytilenaeans, without, however, showing how the inscription can be restored to give that meaning. Still Kahrstedt's analysis of Athenian policy in colonial possessions gives food for serious thought.

The remainder of chapter i deals with the general question of landownership in Attica. Kahrstedt's conclusion that Athens neither claimed nor exercised

any rights prejudicial to private ownership seems to be sound. This clears the way for an illuminating analysis of Athenian mining law, in which he shows that there were two classes of mining properties: those which the state owned, mainly in confiscated Peisistratid land, and those over which the state exercised no property rights. The first class was leased to private individuals at a fixed rent. The other mines were taxed a fixed proportion of the annual production. Thus the state appears in two capacities. As owner of the land in which mining was carried on, it possessed rights little different from those of a private landlord. The chapter concludes with a section on the state as owner of other classes of real estate, temple precincts, streets, public buildings of various sorts, and other holdings used or leased for farming and other business enterprises.

Chapter ii is much the longer of the two. It deals with the legal status of the main classes into which the population of Attica can be divided: citizens, metics, aliens not permanently resident, and slaves. More than two hundred pages are devoted to the relations which existed between the state and its citizens. The treatment is minute and detailed, as, for example, in that section which treats of the official name. Here we find classified various types of public documents, decrees, accounts, etc., so arranged as to show to what extent secretaries, treasurers, archons, movers of decrees, and the like appear with one name alone, with name and demotic, with name and patronymic, or with name, patronymic, and demotic. Much more interesting is Kahrstedt's treatment of other aspects of citizenship. I mention particularly banishment, atimia, ostracism, and other disabilities. Possibly the most valuable part of this section is that devoted to the old tribal organization with its divisions into phratries, gentes, and orgeones (non-aristocratic religious societies formed to give the new citizens of Solon's day admission to the body politic on the same terms as the members of the old clans). In passing Kahrstedt throws light upon the much-debated question of the naucraries, and he traces the decline of the old quadripartite division into Pentekosiomedimnoi, Hippeis, Zeugitai, and Thetes. There is a section on the place of the family in the state, and another on the position of women.

Equally lucid is Kahrstedt's discussion of the legal status of metics, in origin a class permanently domiciled in Athens and owing allegiance to Athens alone. To people like this Solon had granted citizenship in the days when the city was in need of new blood. Later generations, however, were less liberal in granting citizenship to aliens. Still Kahrstedt argues that metic status was essentially one of privilege, despite the fact that certain fixed obligations devolved upon it. Thus it was superior to that of other aliens who might be in Athens for longer or shorter periods. A valuable feature of this section is Kahrstedt's analysis of decrees like the fifth-century treaty with Phaselis (*ibid.*, 16) by which the citizens of Phaselis were given a quasi-metic status. Suits in which they were litigants were to be brought before the polemarch. I

can do no more than mention Kahrstedt's valuable comments on *ateleia*, *synteleia*, and analogous privileges.

From metics we pass to the non-privileged alien, and then to a consideration of the relation of slaves to the state. The chapter ends with a discussion of the honors which Athens granted with ever increasing liberality to loyal citizens and alien benefactors.

In an Appendix the author discusses the *perioecic* communities to which we have referred above. Information about conditions in Salamis, the most important of these communities, is contained in the earliest extant Athenian decree inscribed on stone, an inscription which has been the subject of various restorations and interpretations. Kahrstedt's explanation of its provisions makes further discussion superfluous, or at least it would do so if it were supported with suitable restorations. In brief, he believes that the decree contains supplementary regulations for Athenian *klerouchs* in Salamis. They are required to reside on the island, and to insure their immediate service in the Athenian hoplite forces, they are to be provided with armor at public expense. In his opinion the decree has nothing whatever to do with the native *Salaminians*.

There is an Index, not as full as one might wish, and a modest list of twenty-five inscriptions to the understanding of which Kahrstedt has made some contribution. His modesty in confining the list to so small a number is to be regretted for two reasons: It fails to give due credit to the author, and it imposes upon the epigraphically minded reader the troublesome task of compiling for himself a supplementary index of valuable material scattered through the book.

In conclusion, readers of this volume will await with impatience the completion of the work. English-speaking readers in particular will deplore the mischance which prevented its publication in this country. It may not yet be too late, for the book undoubtedly merits translation.

ALLEN B. WEST

University of Cincinnati

St. Augustine Select Letters, with an English Translation. By JAMES HOUSTON BAXTER, B.D., D.LITT., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of St. Andrews. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

The present selection contains sixty-two letters, about a quarter of St. Augustine's extant correspondence. The choice has been made on the basis of human interest and has been made well. The text is that of Goldbacher, but Professor Baxter has not hesitated in a number of cases to prefer a reading which Goldbacher has relegated to his critical apparatus and the preference in my opinion is generally justified. In an Introduction of forty-two pages, a well-written and in the main excellent survey is given of the social, economic,

and religious conditions in North Africa during the age of Augustine. Then comes a short chronology of Augustine's life and a model bibliography for a work of this kind. The latter covers editions, translations into various languages, general and special works on Augustine, and studies on particular letters. The translation is smooth and usually very accurate. It is certainly superior to previous English renderings and to the French and German translations with which I am familiar. The translator has been liberal in furnishing footnotes to his version, a very welcome feature in a translation of a Christian writer, as without them many statements and allusions are beyond the comprehension of the general reader.

While the book, therefore, is good, it will not be amiss to call attention to certain slips, and in several cases to offer supplementary comment which should enhance the value of the work for the user.

Page xv, lines 12 ff.: Professor Baxter, in stating that entering the clergy was an easy escape from taxation, forgets to mention the legal disabilities placed upon the clergy to prevent their lot from being too enviable. Page xviii, line 8: Marcellinus should not be called "tribune," but rather "tribune and notary." Page xxiv, lines 11 ff.: I cannot follow Professor Baxter in his assertion that the Pauline element in St. Augustine's teaching was irreconcilable with his Catholicism. Page xxvii, line 10 from end: In speaking of the view of Maximus of Madaura that behind the multiple names of divinities there was a common God, Professor Baxter here and on pages 30-31 neglects to mention Neoplatonism as a factor in developing such ideas among the late Pagans. On this whole question see J. Geffcken, *Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (2d ed.; Heidelberg, 1929). Page xxxiv, line 14 from end ff.: "In the pagan festivals are to be found the beginnings of the Christian year; the worship of Tanit or Astarte or Caelestis may have encouraged the veneration of the Virgin Mother; the lesser deities . . . were certainly the prototypes of the Christian saints. . . ." This language is somewhat loose. The pagan festivals are connected with the Christian year only in this sense, that to combat pagan celebrations the Christians deliberately fostered the development of Christian feasts on the same dates to take their place. The cult of the Virgin Mother and the saints has its origin without question in the Christian dogma of the communion of saints. That under the influence of paganism abuses and superstitious practices arose in connection with the veneration of the saints in popular Christian worship cannot of course be denied. Pages xxxviii-xxxix: The titles in Christian Latin epistolography have their difficulties, but they are not as confusing as Professor Baxter would seem to imply. An examination of the data furnished by Sr. Bridget O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 A.D.* (Washington, 1930), shows that a large number of the titles of address are employed according to pretty well-defined principles. Page xlvi, lines 3-4: Migne's reprints, not those of Gaume, are the best-known reprints of the Maurist edition. Professor

Baxter, evidently through an oversight, does not mention the Migne reprints at all. Page 2, last line: The *magister memoriae* was not a keeper of public records but a first secretary (see *Notitia dignitatum*, Or. XIX, Occ. XVII). Page 44, note c: On drunkenness at the martyrs' tombs see Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, article "Agape," columns 816-20. Page 82, note b: On *Exedrae* see Cabrol-Leclercq, article "Exèdre." Page 91, note d: The word "Asiarch" here is surely a proper name, as we have no trace of pagan priests or public officials with this title in the West. The suggestion that the word might be "a synonym for proconsul" betrays an uncertain acquaintance with the public administration of the later Roman Empire. On the pagan Asiarchate one should consult, in part as a correction of Lightfoot, the article "Asiarches" in Pauly-Wissowa. Page 148, note a: On the career of Caecilianus add a reference to J. Sundwall, *Weströmische Studien* (Berlin, 1915), page 59. Page 152, line 3 from end: "But later he tended to despise all the pagan classics [*Conf. i. 13. 20-22*]." Without further comment, this statement might give the modern reader not acquainted with the conventional attitude of the Fathers toward the pagan classics the impression that St. Augustine in later life did not read Vergil, etc., which is surely not the case. Page 158, note a: The allegorization of the myths in the later paganism should not be ascribed to Julian alone, but rather to the Neoplatonists in general from Porphyry and Iamblichus on (see Geffcken, *op. cit.*). Page 198, note e: Professor Baxter believes that names like Quodvultdeus, Adeodatus, etc., were peculiar to Africa, but they are also found elsewhere (see E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres*, III [Berlin, 1931], 3, 47, 78 [Habetdeus], 134-35). Page 208, note b: On *saltus* and *fundus* see rather than Reid and Bois-sier the article "Latifundia" in Daremberg-Saglio, III², 958 ff. and 966 ff., and Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Page 224, note a: A reference to the article "Apse" in Cabrol-Leclercq would be useful here. Page 270, note a: Gibbon's sonorous generalization on the lustre of the Anician name should be supplemented by a reference to the concrete information in the article "Anicius" in Pauly-Wissowa. Page 322, line 7 from end: The treachery of Aetius in respect to Boniface at this time is not certain (see Bury, *History of Later Roman Empire*, I, 245, note b). Page 348, note b: The Largus of this letter is surely to be identified with Largus, proconsul of Africa in 418-19. Professor Baxter makes him proconsul of Africa also in 415, but in this year the office was most probably held by Aurelius Anicius Symmachus (see Sundwall, *Weströmische Studien*, pp. 94 and 137). Page 359, line 6 from end: *Spectabilis* would be better rendered by "right honorable" than by "eminent." Page 366, note a: On *Catholica* for *catholica ecclesia* see also, as being more easily accessible than Rottmanner's *Geistesfrüchte*, the article "Catholique" in Cabrol-Leclercq. Page 398, note a: On church libraries a reference to the article "Bibliothèques" in Cabrol-Leclercq would be useful. Page 420, line 2 from end: There is no reason for doubting that Boniface re-

ceived the title *comes domesticorum* in 425 (see Sundwall, *op. cit.*, p. 57). Page 460, note *a*: On the symbolic use of the ram see the article "Bélier" in Cabrol-Leclercq. Page 478, note *d*: On the habit of painting the face and its denouncement by Christian writers see the interesting material gathered by Sr. Angela Elizabeth Keenan in her edition of the *De habitu virginum* of St. Cyprian (Washington, 1932). Page 480, note *a*: On the use of amulets by Christians see further the illustrated article, "Amulettes," in Cabrol-Leclercq. Page 488, note *a*, line 3: There is nothing in Letter CCLII to indicate that the *vir spectabilis* mentioned is the father of the girl intrusted to the guardianship of the church. *Ibid.*, line 3 from end: It should be made clear that Rusticus is asking the hand of the girl not for himself but for his son. Page 521, note *b*: In reducing solidi to pounds sterling, or to any other modern currency, the question of purchasing power should be taken into consideration. Bury reckoned the purchasing power of the solidus in the fourth century as about that of £2 in 1900. Hence the debt of 17 solidi mentioned should be estimated at a higher figure than £16 (see Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, 50, note 4, and Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches*, I, 177).

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

Die Komposition von Terenz' "Adelphen" und Plautus' "Rudens." By HANS DREXLER. ("Philologus," Supplementband XXVI, Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Pp. 114. RM. 6.70; geb. RM. 8.

In addition to the solution postulated, any study of Roman comedy raises four points: the method employed, the contribution made to our knowledge of New Comedy and to our conception of the Roman technique of adaptation, and the bearing of the latter on early Latin literature.

Drexler's method is a keen analysis of the merest hints in each line and word through which are revealed the contradictions in, and the implications of, our text. Only a careful reading can do justice to the skill with which he extricates Greek elements and from the tangled mass reweaves the fabric of the original. This method, grown out of the scene-balancing technique of the last century, finds its fullest expression in this work. The difference, though only in degree, justifies the remark: "Es ist der bekannte Fehler, die Fabel weiter zu dichten, statt die Worte des Dichters zu interpretieren" (p. 18, Anm.). Criticism of Drexler will arise chiefly because of the inability of any critic to be entirely free from subjectivity in interpretation. Yet it must also be regretted that he has not taken into account evidence from comparison with other plays (in several instances it would have prevented faulty analysis); though Drexler does not even take time to refute the validity of the so-called comparative method, many scholars find no conflict between it and the analytical—they can and should be mutually helpful.

The length of the arguments permits but the barest outline. The Diphilean insertion in *Ad. ii* extends only to 196, and has been altered to represent an (illogical) aftermath of the theft instead of the theft itself. The relations of the *leno* and *adulescens* are changed, and certain motifs (e.g., the girl's freedom, vs. 194) all but eliminated (pp. 1-8). The analysis of scenes 2-4 (pp. 8-27) is the basis for the reconstruction of Menander (pp. 27-40), who opened the act with a short monologue by Aeschines, accompanied by the girl. Enter Ctesipho, summoned from the farm by Syrus; the brothers' dialogue is reflected in ii. 4. Exit Aeschines to farm, Ctesipho and girl within; Syrus meets Sannio (ii. 3). By this inversion of scenes Drexler clarifies obscure motivations, eliminates Sannio when his presence is clearly intolerable, gives the brothers' dialogue and Ctesipho's threatened exile (suicide in the original) better meaning, and explains a difficult note in Donatus, who saw that 209 should follow the scene ending 287.

Disagreement with the whole is difficult, although some arguments, based upon extreme subjectivity of interpretation, will arouse criticism (e.g., the statements that 254 is too elaborate for a man just rescued from death, and 256 too personal to stand in a monologue [p. 26]).

In the *Rudens*, Drexler's analysis shows that if the girls remain in the temple until called to identify the *crepundia*, many difficulties disappear; the altar motif (iii. 3) is Plautine, suggested by i. 3 (pp. 41-64). In iv and v Plautus catered to Roman taste by changing Gripus from a good-natured slave into a mean rascal. This entailed changes in his knowledge of the trunk's contents, the addition of Trachalio's fable (vss. 954 f.), and many briefer insertions (pp. 64-79). Plautine additions in iv. 3 beyond those marked by Jachmann appear in pages 80-88. If the anagnorisis of Daemones and Plesidippus takes place on stage instead of off, the strange movements of the former (iv. 4-8) are explained (pp. 88-94). Labrax' (lost) demand for the trunk between 1358 and 1359, and Gripus' original character explain difficulties in v. 3 (pp. 94-103). Ampelisca's rôle and certain unsatisfactory features of Acts I and II are attributed to a weakness in the Greek (pp. 103-12).

In spite of the plausibility of the whole, a careful reading fails to carry a conviction equal to that of the *Adelphoe*. Without a prologue and a Donatus many interpretations are open to question. This is especially true when Drexler turns from dramatic construction per se to the ferreting-out of Plautine additions on the basis of propriety; throughout pages 80-88 he, as Jachmann before him, betrays the lamentable tendency of German scholarship to interpret the text so literally and so seriously as virtually to eliminate all possibility of playful fantasy. True, we must not leave too much to the audience's imagination; yet if no scope be given to gesture or tone, humor is reduced to cold words and logical sequence, neither of which Diphilus or Plautus could have intended. The argument dealing with Trachalio's fable suffers from this fault, while the admission that it is Greek, but not Diphilean, only confuses the issue. A more serious point is Drexler's opening argument:

the failure of subsequent events to bear out accurately the details of Daemones' dream (iii. 1). Some will justly reply "Why should they?" and others will be surprised at the failure even to consider whether this dream originally belonged to the *Rudens* or *Mercator*. When Plesidippus' failure to greet Palaestra in iii. 6 is employed to show that the girls were originally not on the stage, one looks in vain for a discussion of the many examples of such action which have been explained either as convention or by the exigencies of doubled rôles or mute characters. Nor is any rejection of such explanations given (p. 61). Here one regrets the failure to combine comparison with analysis. Nor is it easy to agree that only between 1368-69 could Gripus be sent for the *vidulum*, for the argument rests partly upon a dangerous overemphasis on the absence of stage directions (p. 97), which makes no allowance even for intelligent acting. The simple solution of Professor Nixon (Loeb ed., 1359) is not considered. Indeed, page 97 may well be taken to exemplify the all too frequent piling-up of untenable interpretations.

Perhaps the most disappointing section, however, is the brief reference to Greek and Roman literature (pp. 113-14). Faith in the fallibility of New Comedy is plainly stated: "Wir müssen also die These von der makellosen Vollkommenheit der Neuen Komödie insoweit wenigstens einschränken, dass diese und die anderen Beobachtungen der vorliegenden Untersuchung dabei Berücksichtigung erfahren." But a closer examination reveals that the weaknesses so disposed of are merely those for which the analysis offers no solution (Ampelisca's rôle, pp. 52-54, 103-4; contradictions in i-ii, p. 111). On the other hand, when the less careful work of a Roman is to be emphasized, the perfect taste of the Greeks is implied by claiming Latin authorship (Terence, p. 13; Plautus, p. 80, vs. 1013 is "zu läppisch" for Diphilus). Again, why would not Diphilus have doubled the altar motif in *Rud.* iii. 3 if elsewhere he might be guilty of a "schwache Stelle" (p. 54)?

Disagreement in interpretation does not vitiate the value of Drexler's work in establishing this type of alteration as a definite feature of Plautine and Terentian technique. By calling this, as well as the mixing of two originals, "contamination," he raises, without comment, the long-disputed question of the word's precise meaning. But a still more important statement is that this type of adaptation "ursprünglicher und älter ist als die Herübernahme einer vollständigen und geschlossenen Szene, . . . Lucio-szene im Miles" (p. 114). This raises a fundamental point in the development of Plautine technique, and controverts usual theories of Plautine chronology. No reasons for this belief are given, and the reviewer confesses to a curiosity enhanced by his own published opinion to the contrary.

In the broader field of Latin literature Drexler modestly hopes that such a specialized study will help to prick scholarship into a necessary revision of its conventional ideas concerning early writing, for which the method of adaptation described no longer allows the term *Übersetzungsliteratur*. Such an *οἰστρος*

this book can truly claim to be, profitable alike to those who agree and disagree, to students of literature as a whole and to specialists in comedy, and all will join in the encouraging hope: "Unser Urteil in jene zentralen Fragen der altlateinischen Literatur ist davon abhängig, dass wir durch eindringende Interpretation und Analyse der einzelnen Stücke das Problem 'Plautus und seine Originale' immer weiter klären."

Ohio State University

JOHN N. HOUGH

Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of His Development. By WERNER JAEGER. Translated with the author's corrections and additions by RICHARD ROBINSON. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. 410.

Mr. Robinson's translation of Jaeger's celebrated book is a welcome addition to our scanty store of English versions of authoritative philological works. Professor Jaeger's *Aristoteles* is the most important book on Aristotle that has appeared since Maier's *Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles*, and has led Aristotelian research into new fields. The difficult philosophical German in which it is written has been a deterrent to many prospective readers; with this barrier removed, the book should soon acquire in English-speaking countries the influence it deserves.

Professor Jaeger writes with contagious enthusiasm. The defense of Aristotle from the imputation of lack of strong religious and moral feeling, and of a misunderstanding of the side of Plato which appears in the myths, is ably carried out, and much needed to offset the current impression of the man produced by that small portion of his works which has survived. The fragments tell a different story, and Professor Jaeger has fully utilized them for the first time in his portrayal of Aristotle's development.

One of the most interesting and instructive parts of Professor Jaeger's work is the utilization of the fragments of Aristotle's *Protrepticus* imbedded in Iamblichus' work of the same name—where, incidentally, he has pointed out much that had not before been claimed for Aristotle—to show that the *Eudemian Ethics* is genuine, and occupies a place in Aristotle's development midway between that of the early dialogue and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. These fragments throw a very considerable light on the *Metaphysics* and *Politics* as well, and it would not be too much to say that without them a considerable part of Professor Jaeger's book could not have been written. In the discussion of the *Physics* and the biological works the fragments are not of much help, and the argument rests chiefly on an acute analysis of style and doctrine.

The final determination of Aristotle's thought, and with it the interpretation of his extant writings, has been carried a great step farther by the results obtained here by Professor Jaeger, and no doubt much will be accomplished in the future by the methods he has indicated.

In the course of the discussion there are many illuminating and detailed interpretations of particular passages, and a wealth of acute observation.

This is not the place for a detailed estimate of the work as a whole, and I shall confine myself to a few minor points, where I have either not been convinced by Professor Jaeger's interpretation or found certain considerations worth adding.

In the discussion of the relations between the dialogue on philosophy, the *Epinomis*, and the *Metaphysics*, it has apparently not been noticed that the latter two at least, in their discussion of the same subject, the meaning of *σοφία*, depend on the *Euthydemus* (282 e 1-4, 288 c 7-293 a 6), just as the *Protrepticus*, as Professor Jaeger has pointed out, relies to a very considerable extent on *Euthydemus* 278 e 3 ff. The Socrates of the *Euthydemus*, after having delivered his protreptic discourse to Clinias, in which it is shown that the generally accepted goods are not good unless used rightly, and that right use depends on knowledge (*σοφία*, *ἐπιστήμη*, or *φρόνησις*; cf. 281 a 8, b 6, 282 a 4, b 3), proceeds to an examination of this *σοφία* (282 e 1-4, 288 c 6-292 e 5), showing that it is not skill in any particular art (288 e 2-291 b 4; cf. *Epin.* 974 b 2-6, d 3-976 b 4—where the examples *θηρευτική* and *στρατηγική* come from the *Euthydemus*—and *Ar. Met.* A 981 a 30-982 a 3). The suggestion is made that it is possibly the royal or political art (291 b 4-292 e 5; cf. *Epin.* 976 d 4, 992 d 5, *Ar. Met.* A 982 a 16), but here too the argument reaches apparently insoluble difficulties, and the dialogue ends, like all the minor dialogues, with no definite result. The phrase *ἡ ζητούμενη ἐπιστήμη* (i.e., *σοφία*) so frequent in the *Metaphysics* occurs in equivalent form in this part of the *Euthydemus* (289 e 1, 291 a 8, c 10, 292 a 8; cf. 293 d 3), and in the *Epinomis* (989 a 1, 974 a 8, c 3). If this common dependence of the *Epinomis*, the *Metaphysics*, and possibly the dialogue on philosophy on the *Euthydemus* is accepted, it is of considerable importance for Professor Jaeger's argument, and has a bearing on such questions as the purpose of the early *Metaphysics*, the authenticity of the *Epinomis*, and the problem of the relation between the *Epinomis*, *Metaphysics*, and dialogue on philosophy. There are many more indications of the dependence of the two preserved works on the *Euthydemus*, and I intend to publish a detailed discussion of the problem in the near future.

The famous fragment from Cicero *De natura deorum* (12, Rose) concerning the men "dwelling beneath the earth in good and shining habitations, adorned with statues and pictures" appears to be taken (p. 164) to refer to "modern, cultivated, satiated, miseducated persons." It would be perhaps more justified to compare *De partibus animalium* A 645 a 11 and the passage from Philo in Rose, frag. 12, and interpret the "shining habitations" and "statues and pictures" as used by Aristotle to show that these subterranean dwellers had a notion of good workmanship which they could apply to the heavens and thereby recognize the divine intelligence behind the celestial appearances. On page 339 the passage from the *De partibus animalium* refers to the idea expressed in the *Topics* (157 a 9) and at the beginning of the

De anima, that one science excels another either in accuracy or by dealing with a nobler subject matter, and it is perhaps unjustified to press it into an affirmation of the absolute precedence of empirical research over metaphysics: it is merely superior in one respect. The implied derivation on page 383 of ἐντελέχεια from ἐν-τελ-ἐχεια is surely untenable. The ἐν- belongs to some form of ἐντελής, the word ἐντελέχεια being compounded of some form of ἐντελής and ἔχειν (cf. H. Diels in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, N.F., XLVII [1916], 202).

Mr. Robinson has ably acquitted himself of a by no means easy task; for an idiomatic and fluent translation of Professor Jaeger's subtle and abstract German requires much the same skill as the translation of Aristotle himself. I have found but very few inaccuracies: on page 74, "mit . . . Prägnanz" is not "frequently"; on pages 87, 126, etc., "Syrianus," not "Syrian," is the English form of Συριανός. There are a few misprints: on page 49, note 1, 403 a 16 should be read (this misprint is inherited from the German edition); page 173, note 1, has φήμι; page 349, note 1, has φάνερον; page 359 has "natural" for "eternal"; page 378, note 2, should read page 45, not page 65. On page 110 the German has *Unerreichbare* for Goethe's *Unbeschreibliche*, which occasions some difficulty in the sense of the English version, where Goethe's text is retained (in Taylor's translation). The translator's versions from the Greek are not always successful: on page 250 τὰ μάλιστα καὶ κυριώτατα καὶ τιμώτατα is "those things which are the thing in the highest degree and are the most authoritative and noblest parts of it"; on page 262, note 2, τῆς ἐπιστήμης θεωρητικῆς οὐσης is "though the knowledge is theoretical," not "Since theoretical knowledge also exists"; on page 69 πάλοι is *supra*, not "frequently"; on page 36, note 1 (Plut. *De virt. mor.* 447F-448A), διὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθές ὁ λογισμός, ὅταν φανῇ, προέμενος τὸ ψεῦδος ἀπέκλινεν is "wherefore reason abandons the false and gladly inclines to the true, when it [the true] appears," and not "Therefore when reason seems to be giving up the false for the true it inclines itself gladly"; on page 136 the "versus" of Zoroaster mentioned by Pliny are probably στίχοι, or lines of prose, and not poetry.

BENEDICT EINARSON

Harvard University

Kaiser Claudius II. Gothicus (268-270 n. Chr.). Von PAUL DAMERAU. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXXIII, N. F., Heft 20.) Leipzig, 1934. Pp. viii+109. RM. 6.50; geb. RM. 8.

It requires no small degree of courage and industry to attempt the biography of a Roman emperor of the latter half of the third century A.D. about whose personal life next to nothing is known, and whose public career falls within a period dominated by forces so overwhelming and impersonal as those at work at that time. Like all of the Caesars of that troubled time, Claudius Gothicus emerged from obscurity late in life, grappled manfully with the prob-

lems of government for a short time, and died in harness. Even his contemporaries probably knew little about him; and that little has been still further diluted by the wretched compilers upon whom we who study his reign must depend. Yet by utilizing to its fullest extent both literary and archaeological evidence Herr Damerau has produced a highly creditable study of a great and worthy ruler.

Like most books dealing with the military-anarchy period, the present one spends considerable space upon an effort to evaluate literary sources. The author distinguishes two principal streams of tradition from which extant accounts have been derived: the *Chronicle* of Dexippus, written by an Athenian historian and statesman contemporary with Claudius, and a Latin source which Enmann has called *The Imperial History*, written about A.D. 300. Both originals are lost; but a careful comparison of extant works enables one to reconstruct their contents and points of view to some extent. On the tortured question of the Augustan history Damerau shows commendable caution. He concludes that the *Vita Claudii* is a compilation from both main streams of tradition, and appears to lean toward Baynes's view that it was written during the reign of Julian—a conclusion which appears to the present reviewer "not proven." His strictures upon the historical character of the *Vita* must win the approval of the reader, but he tries to use it for what it is worth.

Available evidence indicates that Claudius came to the purple about July, 268, and died in the early part of 270. The tradition that his brother Quintillus, who succeeded him, reigned only seventeen or eighteen days, and that Aurelian was proclaimed in Illyricum immediately after Claudius' death is shown to be incorrect by numismatic evidence; and our author concludes that his reign lasted between two and three months, during part of which he was universally acknowledged. A painstaking and helpful analysis of the names and titularies of both imperial brothers is made on the basis of numismatic and epigraphical evidence. Claudius was probably born in Dardania, May 10, 214. Like all of the Illyrian emperors, he was of humble birth. The date of his entry into the army is unknown; but he served with distinction against Ingenuus and in Gaul against Postumus, as well as in Gallienus' Gothic war and the campaign against Aureolus. He was *magister equitum* when Gallienus was assassinated.

Claudius' part in the murder of his predecessor is studiously concealed by the Latin writers, but betrayed by the Greek and Byzantine historians. Damerau describes the assassination as a move by the Illyrians in Gallienus' suite to put one of their number into power so as to assure the defense of their homeland against the barbarians. As emperor he continued the policies of Gallienus, and gave them new direction. His single aim was to save the Balkan lands from the enemy, for from them came the armies whose representative he was. He cleared part of Rhaetia of the Alamanni, and recovered part of Gaul, but allowed Zenobia to conquer Egypt and did not press the war with Tetricus. A great part of the present work is taken up with the Gothic war,

which in some of the literary sources is confused with an earlier one in the last year of Gallienus. His overwhelming victory over the Goths and their failure in Asia Minor ended the peril from that quarter.

The other important incident of Claudius' reign was the destruction of the Gallic city of Augustodunum, which had attempted to desert the Imperium Galliarum and acknowledge Claudius. Damerau thinks that it occurred at the time of Victorinus' death and Tetricus' accession, or about the end of 269. He likewise places the accession of Tetricus after the death of Claudius. It is unfortunate that he ignores a coin cited by Cohen (*Médailles Impériales*, Cl. and Tet. No. 1), containing the portraits of both emperors; for if this coin be genuine it makes certain the existence of some kind of understanding between them, and seriously affects his chronological conclusions.

Claudius' most important known law was one discouraging the growth of *patrocinium* over the lesser plebeians by the *potentiores*; but he likewise forbade the placing of requests for the confiscation of property for regnant. His reign witnessed the progress of the transition in provincial government from senatorial *legati* to equestrian *praesides*. He did not persecute the Christians.

The reign of Quintillus is treated briefly along the same lines as that of his more important brother. There is a helpful Appendix on coin-types of Claudius and Quintillus, and another of selected inscriptions relating to them. The book is prefaced by a helpful Bibliography of general works dealing with the subject, and has copious notes. The type is excellent, and no errors worthy of note exist.

C. E. VAN SICKLE

Ohio Wesleyan University

The Emperor Gaius (Caligula). By J. P. V. D. BALSDON. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xix+234. \$3.50.

Balsdon's book is an important contribution to the history of the early Empire. It gives first a bibliography of modern works on Gaius and then a genealogy of the Julii and Claudii. The first chapter is concerned with the relations between Tiberius and his successor Gaius. The second chapter treats of Gaius' first three years of rule in Rome, while the third sets forth the authorities' accounts of Gaius' activity in Germany and Gaul, and then proceeds to give a rational reconstruction of the events, the conspiracy of Gaetulicus, the German expedition, and the projected invasion of Britain. In chapter iv the conspiracies against Gaius, his murder, and the succession are discussed. Chapter v deals with the anti-Semitic troubles in Alexandria, for which Gaius was not responsible, and his attempt to have his statue set up in the Temple in Jerusalem. The next chapter, on "The Government of Gaius," is subdivided into sections on Gaius and the constitution, his divinity, buildings and shows, finance, and imperial administration. The concluding chapter forms an appraisal of Gaius' character. There are three appendixes, one on

modern scholars' views of Gaius in the north, one on Philo's historical works, and one on the ancient sources.

Among Balsdon's conclusions the following may be mentioned: the bridge of boats at Baiae was built to impress the Parthian hostages; Gaius hastened north in 39 to crush the conspiracy of Gaetulicus; the so-called German campaign consisted of maneuvers to drill and discipline the demoralized Roman troops; the British expedition had to be abandoned because the soldiers refused to embark; there is comparatively slight evidence of wanton cruelty on Gaius' part; he demanded efficiency from his subordinates and the magistrates; he was lavish with his personal funds, but careful with the state's money; his administrative acts on the whole reveal ability, as, for example, in his dealing with Mauretania; he was the object of violent senatorial opposition and conspiracies, to one of which he fell a victim.

Attention may be called to further bibliography on several points: Cichorius' *Römische Studien* deals with Germanicus' visit to Egypt; the hostility of Agrippina toward Tiberius has been recently discussed by Rogers, "The Conspiracy of Agrippina" (*T.A.P.A.*, Vol. LXII [1931]); there are two excellent articles on the galleys of Lake Nemi (the *Mariner's Mirror*, Vol. XV [1929]), one by Speziale and one by Denham; the honorific months in the Roman and Egyptian calendars of Gaius are treated in detail by Scott (*Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. II [1931]). On page 27, line 25, "degree" is apparently a misprint for "decree."

Balsdon's opinion that the authorities exaggerate the truth about Drusilla's deification seems unfounded. In connection with his discussion of the obligation for an emperor to consecrate a deceased wife might be cited the words attributed to Marcus Aurelius in his *Kaisapies* (§§334-35). Balsdon probably underestimates the importance of the association of the emperor's genius with the cult of the Lares.

The biographer has been critical of the biased accounts of the ancient sources, and Gaius is cleared of the charges of insanity and inefficiency, though found to be "prodigal (at least of his own money), immoral, pleasure-loving, and cruel." May he not have in part acquired his aptitude for making cutting remarks from his association with Tiberius?

KENNETH SCOTT

Western Reserve University

Festus Avienus: Ora maritima. By A. BERTHELOT. Edition annotée, précédée d'une Introduction et accompagnée d'un Commentaire. Paris: Librairie Champion, 1934. Pp. 158. 6 maps. Fr. 10.

Berthelot's study is the first detailed commentary on the *Ora maritima* since Schulten's, published in 1922, and has as one of its purposes the refutation of Schulten's reconstruction of the sources. The text is published chiefly for the convenience of students of the Introduction and Commentary, who are referred to Holder's fuller critical apparatus for philological points. Berthelot's

text is not without interest, however, since his geographical studies frequently lead him to accept readings of the *editio princeps* discarded by other editors. The restoration of the orthography of the *editio princeps*, where it reflects fourth-century characteristics, is welcome. Misprints are rare, but in view of Avienus' sometimes curious wording—for his

dura sat vocabula,

Auremque primam cuncta vulnerantia

are not limited to the names of Spanish tribes and rivers—errors which would be self-evident in Cicero are a momentary source of difficulty in this fourth-century archaizer. The translation is broken up into logical sections accompanied by commentary dealing with geographical points, and especially with the location and identification of the tribes mentioned. Several questions remain unsettled, in spite of much illuminating discussion.

Berthelot rejects most of the numerous theories about Avienus' sources, attacking especially Schulten's elaborate scheme of successive revisions of a sixth-century Massiliot Periplus. He finds much of value, however, in Schulten's text and commentary. He does not consider the *Ora maritima* a real periplus, and maintains that the sources cannot be as exactly determined or schematized as earlier commentators have thought. No native of Marseilles, he is convinced, could have written the description of that city. The various sources extend from the Tyrian colonization of Spain to the time of Theodosius, but the general picture is that of the sixth to the fourth century B.C., according to the traditions preserved in the city of Gades. "It requires an obstinate *parti pris* to claim attribution to a single date and a periplus for this archaising poem." But Avienus' use of Greek sources of the period when the Iberian coast was frequented by Greek merchants is conspicuous. "The omission of Emporium, contrasting strangely with the addition of the names of Tarragon and Barcelona, may characterize the method of Avienus, who searches archaic documents and mingles his summary of them with his impressions as an official of the fourth century A.D."

Many of the commentators' errors in emendation of the text and in identification of Avienus' geographical names are due to faulty use of geological theory; others, Berthelot thinks, to failure to realize the difference between the ancient navigator's view of the littoral and our "cartographic vision founded on geodesy." Maps of Europe and Spain according to Avienus, Strabo, and Agrippa illustrate this point.

The most important contribution of the *Ora maritima*, according to the present editor, is its description of the migration of the Oestrymnians, a Celtic group, from Western Spain to Brittany and the British Isles and thence to the Danish peninsula, the route of the Megalithic culture of the dolmen-builders. This would harmonize with Livy's dating of the Celtic movement into Italy, and with Schumacher's view of their settlements along the Rhine, but antedates considerably the dates of the Celtic migrations assumed by many authorities. Berthelot ascribes Avienus' information on these migra-

tions to his interpretation of ancient traditions rather than to direct literary accounts.

The rich commentary on the geography and ethnology of Spain must be left for the specialist on these points to evaluate; and only the specialist can determine whether Berthelot is justified in his claim of substituting the rules of method for the "elegant fragility" and "paradoxical imaginings" of Schulten and others. Polemics apart, this commentary and that of Schulten both seem indispensable for future students of Avienus and of ancient Spain.

Avienus presents not only matter for geographical study, but an excellent example of fourth-century participation in the "medieval" habit of reverence for the ancient written word as authority where contemporary evidence would seem far more practical, and readily obtainable. As Schulten points out in this connection, Ephorus in the fourth century B.C., albeit with greater talents, had much the same archaizing habit. But consideration of Avienus' other literary activities, especially the lost verse epitomes of Vergil and Livy, makes the idea of a geographical study based more on thousand-year-old accounts than on present conditions seem less fantastic. Avienus clearly wrote not for the traveling but for the reading public, and his *Ora maritima* serves as a guidebook for the student to whom the voyages of Heracles, Odysseus, and Aeneas are of more real concern than those of contemporary merchants. The fourth century figures chiefly in mentions of the destruction that had in various sites overwhelmed the ancient cities.

EVA M. SANFORD

Western Reserve University

Citizens of Long Ago: Essays on Life and Letters in the Roman Empire. By ADELINE BELLE HAWES. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. vii+183. \$2.50.

This book is a *monumentum aere perennius* erected by Wellesley College to Adeline Belle Hawes, professor of Latin at Wellesley for thirty-seven years. It is a living memorial created out of her own writings, full of her personality and of her joy in Rome. Grant Showerman's eloquent Introduction was not needed to commend the volume to students, colleagues, and friends of Miss Hawes who have been given this opportunity to hear her go on talking although she is invisible.

The collection of nine informal essays deals with Plutarch, the essayist; Fronto, teacher and friend of Marcus Aurelius; Martial and his epigrammatic pictures of Rome; Lucian's satire of Greek life; the Hellenism of the Emperor Julian; the fifth-century poetic travelogue of Rutilius Namatianus. Two essays of more general character discuss child life in the Roman Empire and charities and philanthropies. Among such varied subjects a pervading theme which links them closely is the interpretation of less known authors and of everyday life as seen through their eyes. In her comments on Plutarch on

page 44, Miss Hawes recorded her interest: "There is so much of the commonplace in human life that there is nothing more useful than the commonplace for becoming acquainted with the people of an earlier age."

The adult reader must regret absence of a bibliography, of exact references to authors, of an editing which would have canceled many repetitious words, phrases, and sentences. (In the essay on "Little Citizens of Long Ago," the word "little" occurs over eighty times in twenty-two and a half pages.) The mistakes in proofreading are few: *frogotten*, page 69; *Solo*, page 106; *Alcineus*, page 109. But any comment on such lacks in the publication of these unrevised manuscripts is unnecessary caviling. We may quote with Miss Hawes Fronto's question: "Why regret the seed or the blossom after the fruit has matured?" The author herself would have been the first to protest modestly as Horace did of his *sermones* that these essays are conversations, not learned works, and if the informality and richness of the talks make the listener wish that Miss Hawes were present to be interrogated about her sources, none the less he enjoys the charm and the humor of these unannotated comments on personalities and on human traits.

A motto for the title-page might be the familiar phrase of Terence, quoted here for Plutarch: "*Homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto.*" And the epilogue of the volume is fittingly Rutilius' passionate laudation of Rome, "fairest queen of all the world." Through the essays the author herself is revealed as the *anima candida* of her Lucian (p. 145): a "bluff-hater, cheat-hater, liar-hater, and vanity-hater, . . . a lover of truth and beauty and simplicity." This is a book to give young people to help them sense the vitality, the humor, and the ethics of "Citizens of Long Ago."

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT

Vassar College

Alchemy, Child of Greek Philosophy. By ARTHUR JOHN HOPKINS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. xi+262. \$3.50.

Professor Hopkins presents a readable account of alchemy, which will satisfy the general reader. One infers from the numerous charts and illustrations that the book is intended for the general reader who knows little of general history or the history of ideas.

The view here presented is that alchemy proper began in Egypt as a group of empirical techniques concerned with the production of colors, preferably rich and luminous, and was there combined with the Greek conception of qualitative change (*ἀλλοίωσις*), especially as developed and defined by Aristotle. A base, essentially neutral, is thus by methods, traditional in the crafts and handed down as secrets, converted into something infinitely more valuable, whose desirable qualities are chiefly those of color. In this sense alchemy is the child of Greek philosophy, but it is also the proof of its validity. True

alchemy was always in this sense Egyptian. Later developments and degenerations of the conception and methods are sufficiently traced through the Mohammedan revival and the introduction of alchemy in the West during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries down to the dominance of the phlogiston theory.

So far as this goes the conception of the development of alchemy is generally sound and will satisfy the general reader. Even the Hellenist, who may not be adequately versed in chemistry, will be grateful for the identification by a competent chemist of the substances used by the alchemists and for the elucidation of their methods. But the scholar who is interested in the history of ideas would wish to see the inquiry pushed much farther. What reason is there, he will ask, for thinking that the techniques were specifically and originally Egyptian? The tradition of alchemy certainly points in that direction; but that may be due only to the circumstance that it was in Egypt that they were interpreted by philosophical ideas. And as for these ideas themselves, one desires a more penetrating study of them, especially of the Greek conceptions of change and of color. Professor Hopkins might have thrown light on these and similar subjects if he had been concerned to make a special contribution to the history of science.

W. A. HEIDEL

Wesleyan University

Philo. With an English translation by R. F. COLSON and G. H. WHITAKER. ("Loeb Classical Library Series.") London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1929. Pp. vi+626. Cloth 10s.; leather 12s. 6d. net.

Not the least of the services that the Loeb Library has performed for contemporary letters is to make available for easy and convenient use the impressive figure who, more than any other single individual, symbolized and even created the confluence of Hellenic thought and Jewish sacred scriptures to give rise to the Christian Platonic school of Alexandria, and to make possible Christian theology as a system of organized speculation. The present translation by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (the latter unhappily died in 1930 before he could complete the work) is worthy of its predecessors in the series. There are a compact Introduction and brief notes on important philosophical and textual points. The text is based on Cohn and Wendland, and where the present translators disagree with this text, the change is usually in a conservative direction.

A. D. WINSPEAR

University of Wisconsin

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Die Antike: Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur des klassischen Altertums.* (Herausgegeben von WERNER JAEGER, XI, Heft 2 [1935], 85-148.) Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935.
- BANNES, JOACHIM. *Platon: Die Philosophie des heroischen Vorbildes.* Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. xi+145. RM. 5.60.
- BRADY, THOMAS ALLAN. *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks (330-30 B.C.).* ("University of Missouri Studies: A Quarterly of Research," Vol. X, No. 1 [January 1, 1935].) Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, 1935. Pp. 90. \$1.25 per copy; \$4.00 per year.
- BUTLER, H. E. (ed.). *The Fourth Book of Virgil's "Aeneid."* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. vi+91. 2s. 6d. net.
- CAPLAN, HARRY. *Mediaeval "Artes praedicandi": A Hand-List.* ("Cornell Studies in Classical Philology," Vol. XXIV.) Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1934. Pp. 54. \$1.50.
- COON, RAYMOND H. William Warde Fowler: *An Oxford Humanist.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1934. Pp. x+366. 10s. 6d. net.
- DEFERRARI, ROY J. *St. Basil: The Letters, Vol. IV: With an English Translation.* ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1934. Pp. xv+461.
- DEN DULK, W. J. KPAZIZ: *Bijdrage tot de grieksche Lexicographie.* Dissertation. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1934. Pp. xii+128.
- FLICKINGER, MINNIE KEYS. *The $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\rho\iota\alpha$ of Sophocles' "Antigone."* Dissertation. ("Iowa Studies in Classical Philology," No. 2.) Iowa City: The Author, 1935. Pp. 82. \$1.25.
- GIGON, OLOF. *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit.* Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. viii+163. RM. 5; geb. RM. 6.50.
- GUDEMAN, A. *Aristoteles Poetik: Mit Einleitung, Text und Adnotatio critica, exegetischem Kommentar, kritischem Anhang und Indices nominum, rerum, locorum.* Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. viii+496. RM. 16.
- HENRY, PAUL. *Plotin et l'Occident: Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, Saint Augustin et Macrobe.* ("Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents," Fasc. 15.) Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense" Bureaux, 1934. Pp. 292. Belgas 18.
- Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, III, No. 4, 311-480. ("The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora," Report V.) Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1934. Pl. 1; figs. 122. \$1.00.
- HUDE, C. (ed.). *Xenophon: Memorabilia. Editio maior.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. vi+195. RM. 3.80; geb. RM. 4.80.
- HUTTON, JAMES. *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800.* ("Cornell Studies in English," Vol. XXIII.) Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1935. Pp. xiv+663. \$3.00.
- KNOCH, ULRICH. *Magnitudo Animi: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines römischen Wertgedankens.* (Philologus, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. viii+93. RM. 5.50; geb. 6.80.

- LANGERBECK, HERMANN. ΔΟΞΙΣ ΕΠΙΠΤΕΜΗ: *Studien zu Demokrits Ethik und Erkenntnislehre*. ("Neue philologische Untersuchungen," Heft 10.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Pp. 132. RM. 10.
- LATTE, KURT. *Salkust*. ("Neue Wege zur Antike," II. Reihe: *Interpretationen*, Heft 4.) Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1935. Pp. ii+60. RM. 3.20.
- LYDE, LIONEL W. *Contexts in Pindar with Reference to the Meaning of φέγγος*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935. Pp. xiv+58. 5s. net.
- MCDOWELL, ROBERT HARBOLD. *Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris*. ("University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series," Vol. XXXVI.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Pp. xviii+272. Pls. 6. \$3.50.
- MC EWAN, CALVIN W. *The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship*. (Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, "Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization," No. 13.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934. Pp. xii+34. \$1.00.
- MOUNTFORD, J. F. *The Scholia Bembina: Edited with Annotations*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 1934. Pp. vii+131. 10s. 6d. net.
- MUGLER, CH. *La fréquence et la distribution des formes nominales du verbe en Grec et en Latin*. (*Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, troisième série, années et tomes VIII et IX [60^e et 61^e de la collection], 4^e livraison [Octobre, 1934], et 1^{re} livraison [Janvier, 1935].) Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1935. Pp. 42.
- NEHRBASS, RUDOLF. *Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidaurios: Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. 92. RM. 6.
- Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami, denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN et H. M. ALLEN*, Vol. VIII (1529-30): *Compendium vitae P. S. Allen addidit H. W. GARROD*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xlv+516. \$10. Pls. 3.
- PAGE, DENYS L. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xi+228. \$3.50.
- RAND, EDWARD KENNARD, and JONES, LESLIE WEBBER. *The Earliest Book of Tours: With Supplementary Descriptions of Other Manuscripts of Tours*. ("Studies in the Script of Tours," Vol. II; Mediaeval Academy of America, Pub. No. 20.) Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1934. Pp. xvii+136. Pls. 60. \$18.50 post-free (to members of the Academy, \$14.80).
- ROMANES, N. H. *Further Notes on Lucretius*. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 1935. Pp. 84.
- S. *Aureli Augustini confessionum libri tredecim: Post pium Knoell iteratis curis editit MARTINUS SKUTELLA*. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. xxxii+381. RM. 5.40; geb. RM. 6.80.
- SCHELHA, RENATA VON. *Dion: Die Platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien*. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Pp. viii+166. Mit Münztafel und Karte. RM. 5.50; geb. RM. 6.50.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. XIII. Oslo: A. W. Brogger, 1934. Pp. 147.
- DE VEAU, FREDERIC J. (ed.). *The "Bucolics" of Vergil*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xxiv+220. \$1.25.
- WASZINK, J. H. *Index verborum et locutionum quae "De anima" libro continentur: Accedunt addenda et corrigenda ad editionem libri eiusdem*. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1935. Pp. iv+263.
- WEST, LOUIS C. *Roman Gaul: The Objects of Trade*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1935. Pp. xii+191. 7s. 6d. net.
- WESTLAKE, H. D. *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.: With a Map*. London: Methuen, 1935. Pp. viii+248. 8s. 6d. net.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXX

- A History of Olynthus with a Prosopographia and Testimonia*, Gude **278**
- Alchemy, Child of Greek Philosophy*, Hopkins **371**
- Anacharsis, source of story of, in Herodotus **119**
- ancient sources for definitions of Athenian trade, discussed **327**
- antiphonal *carmen* and *cibum promiscuum et innoxium* (Pliny x. 96. 7), of Bithynian Christians, discussed **168**
- Apocolocyntosis* vii. i, of Seneca **350**
- appeal in general and particular scrutinies, discussed **306 f.**
- Ariadne and Europa myths, discussed **292**
- Arimaspeia* of Aristeas, as a source for Herodotus' *Scythica* **118**
- Aristophanes *Acharnians* 23 ff. **262**; *Clouds* 975 f., two aspects of **10**; *Thesmophoriazuses* 1181, *Knights*, Hypothesis I (II) **263**; wilful misinterpretation in **16**
- Aristotle: *Fundamentals of the History of His Development*, Jaeger, trans. Robinson **363**
- art of formula in Homer **215**
- Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, Bonner **85**
- Athenian citizenship, scrutiny and appeal in **302**
- Athens, law of citizenship at **304 f.**
- Aulularia*, *Asinarii*, and *Epidicus* of Plautus, analyses of **51**
- Aulus Cascellius, case of, in dating Horace's *De arte poetica* **1**
- Ausgewählte Schriften*, von Eduard Wölfflin, ed. Meyer **93**
- bad omens, effective means of avoiding of **106**
- Bithynian Christians **167**
- books received **95, 191, 287, 373**
- broad farce and slave-controlled intrigue in Plautus **46**
- burlesque in Horace, significance of, in dating *De arte poetica* **7**
- candor, use of, in Roman literature **313**
- Captivi*, *Menaechmi*, *Mercator* of Plautus, three characteristics of **48 ff.**
- Catalepton* 13, significance of, as evidence of Vergil's military experience **77**
- Catullan echoes in *Odes* of Horace **289**
- Catullus, attitude of Horace toward **295**; extent of influence of, on Horace **301**; manuscript Ottob. 1829(R) of **163**; liii, date of, discussed **74**
- Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, Wheeler **92**
- Choricus xx-xxiii and *Dyscolus* of Menander, discussed **158**
- Cicero's *Philippics*, Codex Maffeiianus of **161**
- Citizens of Long Ago: Essays on Life and Letters in the Roman Empire*, Hawes **370**
- Cnemon and Smierines, as characters in Menander **151**
- Codex Maffeiianus of Cicero's *Philippics* **161**
- Columbia Papyri, four private letters from **141**
- contaminatio*, in *Miles gloriosus*, Jachmann's theory of, discussed **229**
- Das Studium der byzantinischen Geschichte vom Humanismus bis zur Jetztzeit*, Gerland **189**
- date, of Catullus liii **74**; of Demosthenes lvii **303**
- decree, of Demophilus, discussed **302**; and law, in Athens **310**
- δεδορημένος (Nonnos *Dionysiaca* i. 69), changed to δεδορημένον, by Köchly **78**

- definition of *struppus* **135**
 definitions of terms of trade, in Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes, Isocrates **322 f.**
 Delian and Delphian versions of story of Croesus **120**
 Demophilus, decree of, discussed **302**
 Demosthenes lvii, date of, discussed **303**
Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius, Sauter **172**
 development of Plautus' art **43**
Die Komposition von Terenz' "Adelphen" und Plautus' "Rudens," Drexler **360**
Die Niobe des Aischylos, Schadewaldt **92**
Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in republikanischer Zeit, Heuss **176**
 difficulties of *Miles gloriosus*, structural, discussed **230 ff.**
 dogs, in rites of aversion: scape-dog **32**; in omens: howling and barking **35**; in witchcraft **38**
 Dolon's disguise in the *Rhesus* **349**
 duodecimal system, as origin of term *litterae unciales* **254**

 emendation, of Strabo xvi. 4. 10 **352**;
 of Vitruvius, discussed **337**
 "Εμπορος, Ναύκληρος, Κάπηλος, in Athenian trade **320**
 ἐπ' ἀκινήτοις (Hesiod *Works and Days* 750), as magical reference **14**
 ἔπεα πτερόεντα, in Homer **215**
 ἐπεισδιδόν, meaning of **260**
 Epicureanism and *παρηγορία* **312**
 ἔπος τ' ἔφαρ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζε, in Homer, discussed **224**
 Ethiopians and Hyperboreans **115**
 Etruscans and Gauls, Rome's battles with, in 284–282 B.C. **23**
 Europa, myth of, discussed **290**
Excavations at Olynthus, Part V: *Mosaics, Vases and Lamps Found in 1928 and 1931*, eds. Robinson, Others **177**; Part VI: *The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931*, ed. Robinson **82**

Festus Avienus: Ora maritima, ed. Berthelot **368**
 Flavian coins, imperial symbols on **131**
 foreign relations of Rome, during Illyrian and Macedonian wars **198 f.**
 formula in Homer: ἔπεα πτερόεντα **215**;
 ἔπος τ' ἔφαρ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζε **224**

Geschichte der juristischen Person, Schnorr v. Carolsfeld **174**
 Gomme's theory of the decree of Demophilus, discussed **302**
 γραφή ξένιας and appeal in Athens, discussed **308**
 Greece, political status of, between 196 and 146 B.C. **193**
 Greek expressions **259**
Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden, ed. Curschmann **281**
 Gudianus(G) in text tradition of Vitruvius, discussed **342**; contributions of, discussed **345**

 Hasebroek's nomenclature of Athenian trade **324**; criticism of **333**
 Herodotus, Utopian sources in **113**
 Herodotus' account of the Agathyrsi **121**
 Hieronymus Ferrarius' quotations of manuscripts, of Cicero's *Philippics* **161**
hoc age (Plautus *Captivi* 444), discussed **72**
 Homer, art of formula in **215**
 Horace, check-list of **353**; *Odes* i. 3 and iv. 12, discussed **318**; *parresia* poems of **312**
 Horace's attitude toward Catullus, discussed **295**; *De arte poetica*, new dating of **1**
Horati Carmina viginti, ed. Campbell **90**
 Hyperboreans and Ethiopians **115**

 image in the sand **10**
 imperial symbols, on certain Flavian coins **131**

- Introduction to Early Roman Law: The Patriarchal Joint Family, II: Joint Family and Family Property*, Westrup **265**
- Jachmann's theory of *contaminatio*, in *Miles gloriosus*, discussed **229**
- Julia and Lucius Vinicius **170**
- Kaiser Claudius II. *Goticus* (268-270 n. Chr.), Damerau **365**
- Knorrhage's views on terms of Athenian trade **326**; criticism of **334**
- La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique*, Cohen **182**
- Latin manuscripts, three classes of **252**
- law, and decree in Athens **310**; of Athenian citizenship, discussed **304 f**
- lectisternia*, two types of, discussed **123**
- Les mythes de Platon: Etude philosophique et littéraire*, Frutiger **270**
- Libanius' two sketches of "morose men" **155**
- Licinius Murena (Horace *Odes* ii. 10), identity of, discussed **315**
- life and thought of Graeco-Roman Egypt, as found in private papyrus letters **141**
- literary development of Plautus, three periods of, posited **44**
- litterae unciales*, mention of, in medieval sources **249**
- ludi scaenici* and *sellisternium* **127**
- Λόκειον δοράν (Euripides *Rhesus* 208-15), and Apollo Λόκειος, discussed **349**
- M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Vol. II, Fasc. 4: *Brutus*; Vol. III, Fasc. 5: *Orator*, ed. Reis **88**
- magical prescription, three forms of, meanings of **11**
- mandatum* of folk contract (Plautus *Capt.* 444-46), relationship of, to *mancipium* of XII Tables (*Tab.* VI) and *percussit* of Livy's ritual contract (*De urbe cond.* i. 24. 7-9) **73**
- manuscript problem of Vitruvius **342**
- Menander's *Dyscolus*, plot of **151**
- μερόπη, meaning of **260**
- Miles gloriosus*, structure of **228**
- military experience, of Vergil, discussed **76**
- misinterpretation, in Aristophanes, reason for **16**
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*: Vol. III, *Denkmäler aus dem Rauhen Kilikien*, eds. Keil, Wilhelm; Vol. IV, *Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia*, eds. Buckler, Calder, Guthrie **279**
- Nonnos *Dionysiaca* i. 69-71 **78**
- notes on *Oedipus Tyrannus* **66**
- ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ αἱ περὶ Σωκράτους ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ, Ἀγγελόπουλος **190**
- ὁ παῖς καλός, meaning of **262**
- objects, triangular and semicircular, on certain Flavian coins, identification of **131**
- Odes* of Horace, Catullan echoes in **289**
- Odyssey* ix. 21-26, meaning of **262**
- omens from chance actions and from names of dogs **37**
- oriental tales, relation of *Miles gloriosus* to **245**
- origin and meaning of term "uncial" **247**
- Ottob. 1992, Maffei manuscript probably cited by Ferrarius **163**
- ΠΑΝΤΗΕΡΤΑΘΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΖΟΦΟΝ (Homer i. 25-26), discussed **79**
- Paoli's views on Athenian trade **326**
- parresiasic poems of Horace **312**
- παρηγορία, as an Epicurean corollary **312**
- Pervigilium Veneris*, transposition of verses in **255**; difficulties of vss. 8-11, 58-62 of, discussed **256**
- Philo*, trans. Colson, Whitaker **372**
- Philodemus' epitome of Zeno's *περί παρηγορίας*, **312**
- Plato *Republic* v. 450b. 3: χρυσοχοήσοντας **347**

- Platon et l'art de son temps* (arts plastiques), Schuhl **273**
- Πλάτωνος 'Ακαδήμεια ἢ περὶ γενέσεως τῆς πρὸς ἀνέλευσιν αὐτῆς ιδέας, 'Αριστόφρων **189**
- Plautus, development of art of **43**; technique of, in his last years **53**
- Plautus' *Aulularia* and Menander's *Dyscolus*, relationship of **154**
- ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΑΚΗΡΤΚΤΟΣ **164**
- Polybius and the later version of Rome's battles in 284-282 B.C. **24 ff.**
- private papyrus letters, style and contents of **141**
- προβεβηκότων vs. προσβεβηκότων (Strabo xvi. 4. 10), discussed **352**
- prolegomena to study of Athenian trade **320**
- protreptic and parresiasic poems of Horace, distinction between **317**
- Pseudo-Marius **58**; activities of, in Rome **60**; analysis of character of **64**
- pulvinar*, meaning of, discussed **128**
- Pythagorean features, in Platonic picture of Socrates **17**; in Dikaio's Logos of Aristophanes' *Clouds* **18**; interpretation of **22**
- Quintilius Varus, bearing of death-year of, on date of Horace's *De arte poetica* **4**
- Ratio et les mots de la famille de reor*, Yon **180**
- Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*, Kenyon **188**
- retractatio* in Plautine technique **45**
- Reviews
- 'Αγγελόπουλος: 'Ο 'Αριστοφάνης καὶ αὶ περὶ Σωκράτους ιδέαι αὐτοῦ (Costas) **190**
- 'Αριστόφρων: Πλάτωνος 'Ακαδήμεια (Costas) **189**
- Balsdon's *Emperor Gaius Caligula* (Scott) **367**
- Baxter's trans. *St. Augustine Select Letters* (McGuire) **357**
- Berthelot's *Festus Avienus: Ora maritima* (Sanford) **368**
- Bonner's *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* (West) **85**
- Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray's *Old Testament in Greek*, Vol. II, Part III (Colwell) **188**
- Buscaroli's *Virgilio: Il libro di Didone* (Salmon) **184**
- Campbell's *Horati Carmina viginti* (Haight) **90**
- Cohen's *La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique* (Larsen) **182**
- Colson and Whitaker's trans. *Philo* (Winspear) **372**
- Conway, Whatmough, and Johnson's *Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* (Buck) **94**
- Curschmann's *Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden* (Youtie) **281**
- Damerau's *Kaiser Claudius II. Goticus* (Van Sickle) **365**
- Drexler's *Komposition von Terenz' "Adelphen" und Plautus' "Rudens"* (Hough) **360**
- Duff's trans. *Silius Italicus "Punica"* (Sanford) **186**
- Frutiger's *Les mythes de Platon* (Hack) **270**
- Gerland's *Studium der byzantinischen Geschichte* (Costas) **189**
- Gude's *History of Olynthus* (Larsen) **278**
- Hawes' *Citizens of Long Ago* (Haight) **370**
- Heuss' *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik* (Larsen) **176**
- Hopkins' *Alchemy, Child of Greek Philosophy* (Heidel) **371**
- Jaeger's *Aristotle*, trans. Robinson (Einarson) **363**
- Kahrstedt's *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen* (West) **354**
- Kenyon's *Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (Colwell) **188**
- Köster's *Antikes Seewesen* (McCartney) **283**

- Löfstedt's *Syntactica* (Whatmough) **276**
- Magie's *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, Vol. III (Van Sickle) **183**
- Meyer's *Ausgewählte Schriften von Eduard Wölfflin* (Beeson) **93**
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, Vols. III, IV (Larsen) **279**
- Nesselhauf's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie* (West) **80**
- Reis' *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Vol. II, Fasc. 4, Vol. III, Fasc. 5 (Beeson) **88**
- Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus*, Part V (Johnson) **177**; Part VI (Bellinger) **82**
- Sauter's *Römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius* (Scott) **172**
- Schadewaldt's *Niobe des Aischylos* (O'Neill) **92**
- Schnorr v. Carolsfeld's *Geschichte der juristischen Person* (Radin) **174**
- Schuhl's *Platon et l'art de son temps* (Hack) **273**
- Schur's *Sallust als Historiker* (Canter) **87**
- Welles's *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (Boak) **179**
- Westrup's *Early Roman Law*, Part II (Radin) **265**
- Wheeler's *Catullus and Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (Prescott) **92**
- Yon's *Ratio et les mots de la famille de reor* (Petersen) **180**
- Rhesus*, Dolon's disguise in **349**
- Roman conception of foreign relations **195**
- Rome, treaties of, with Sparta, Messene, Elis (Appendix I) **210**; with Achaean League (Appendix II) **212**
- Rome's battles, in 284-282 B.C., with Etruscans and Gauls **23**
- Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, Weiles **179**
- St. Augustine Select Letters*, trans. Baxter **357**
- Sallust als Historiker*, Schur **87**
- sand, image in **10**
- scholiasts and lexicographers, on terms of Athenian trade, discussed **330**
- scrutiny and appeal, in Athenian citizenship **302**
- sellisternium* and theatrical *pompa* **122**
- Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* vii. i **350**
- signs, from meeting quadrupeds **99**; snakes **102**; birds **103**; persons **105**
- Silius Italicus "Punica,"* trans. Duff **186**
- Sophocles *Oedipus Tyrannus*, notes on, **66 ff.**
- Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen: Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens*, Teil I, Kahrstedt **354**
- Strabo xvi. 4. 10, forgotten emendation of **352**
- strophic theory of *Pervigilium Veneris* **255**
- struppus*, defined **135**
- Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens*, Köster **283**
- Suetonius *Aug.* 64, discussed **170**
- superstition in Latin literature, place of dog in **32, 39, 42**
- symbols and adornment of Flavian coins, reason for variation in, discussed **134**
- Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, Löfstedt **276**
- taboo on dogs **37**
- term "uncial," origin and meaning of **247**
- The Old Testament in Greek*, Vol. II: *The Later Historical Books*, Part III, "I and II Chronicles," eds. Brooke, McLean, Thackeray **188**
- The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*, 3 vols., Conway, Whatmough, Johnson **94**
- The Scriptores historiae Augustae*, Vol. III, trans. Magie **183**
- theatrical *pompa*, and *sellisternium* **122**

- theory of quatrains, in *Pervigilium Veneris* **255**
- Thrasymachus' interjection (*χρυσοχοήσοντας*, Plato *Rep.* v. 450b. 3), significance of **347**
- transposition of verses in *Pervigilium Veneris* **255**
- treaties of Rome, with Sparta, Messene, Elis (Appendix I) **210**; with Achaean League (Appendix II) **212**
- τρίγλυφος*, meaning of **261**
- ubi mures ferrum rodunt* (Seneca *Apolocytosis* vii. i), meaning of **350**
- uncia*, three possible meanings of **251**
- uncialis*, as first used by Jerome **247**
- Unheralded War, Walker's theory of **165**; Herodotus' account of **166**
- Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutsch-attischen Symmachie*, Nesselhauf **80**
- Utopian sources in Herodotus **113**
- Vergil, military experience of **76**
- Vinicius and Julia, visit of, at Baiae **170**
- Virgilio: Il libro di Didone*, Buscaroli **184**
- Vitruvius, emendation of **337**; manuscript problem of **342**
- Vitruvius' Latin, quality of, discussed **338**
- war of sexes, possibility of introduction of, by Menander **157**
- wayfaring signs **97**; medieval and modern examples of **107**; theories about origin of **110**
- Wesseling's emendation of Strabo xvi. 4. 10, discussed **352**
- χρυσοχοήσοντας*, Plato *Rep.* v. 450b. 3 **347**
- Zeno of Sidon, and *παρηγορία* **312**

LAWYERS *and* LITIGANTS *in* ANCIENT ATHENS

By ROBERT J. BONNER

Ever jealous of the expert, the Athenians tried to prevent the rise of a legal profession. But sycophants, speech-writers, and advocates—the earliest lawyers—plied their trade in spite of the restrictions. In modern times they have not had the study they deserve from historians. Their activities are here traced in clearer detail than ever before.

\$2.50, postpaid \$2.60

THE BUSINESS LIFE OF ANCIENT ATHENS

By GEORGE W. CALHOUN

Many aspects of the life of the ancient Athenian have been made familiar, but we know very little of the busy docks and markets in the Piraeus, or the industrial region around Laurium, almost modern in its dirtiness and desolation. Mr. Calhoun's exposition of the ancient Athenian's aims and ideals and standards of honesty emphasizes the beginning of the business standards that serve as a background to the commercial activities of the modern world.

\$2.00, postpaid \$2.10

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO . . . ILLINOIS

The Development of Virgil's Art

By

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

Virgil the literary artist is too often forgotten in Virgil as a means of learning the Latin language. Here is a new interpretation of the great writer which indicates his position in the history of literature. Mr. Prescott applies to this classic of the ancient world the methods of modern critical appreciation.

"The book will be read with profit by teachers of Virgil, and can claim a legitimate place on the shelves of intelligent readers of literature who occasionally range into the ancient field."—*The Saturday Review of Literature.*

"He has done his task well and in an interesting manner. His book, in spite of its volume, is likely to find many a delighted reader not only among professional classicists, but also in the wider circle of those who care for the understanding of the foundations on which the great literature of Western civilization has been reared."—*New York Herald-Tribune.*

\$4.00, postpaid \$4.15

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS

▲ New . . .

STUDIES IN DRAMATIC "PREPARATION" IN ROMAN COMEDY

By

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

This study establishes the existence of the theory of "preparation" and demonstrates that the ancient dramatists consciously and regularly applied this theory in writing their plays. It is the first systematic study in the field.

The extant plays of Menander, Plautus, and Terence are examined and the difficult problems of contamination and Roman originality are studied in the light of evidence heretofore never thoroughly considered.

103 pages, planographed, paper-bound
\$1.00; postpaid \$1.10

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

".... beyond question a great work

WHAT PLATO SAID

by PAUL SHOREY

"... This volume represents the ripe fruit of a long life devoted to the study of Plato, and, as such, it is of the greatest value." *Classical Review* (England).

"... we have few examples in contemporary literature of so brilliant a prose style. His studies of the Symposium and the Republic combine the virtues of an excellent re-translation with the sharpest of critical insight." HORACE GREGORY, *New York Evening Post*.

"... in spite of all differences of opinion, it will be universally agreed that this is a monument of ripe scholarship, immense range of acquaintance with the major and minor contributions to Platonic scholarship which the past years have produced, and a lively sense of the way in which for the whole-hearted Platonist modern literature supplies parallels and suggestions, even unto Aldous Huxley and Dreiser." G. S. BRETT, University of Toronto, *The International Journal of Ethics*.

\$5.00

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

